THE MIND OF ST. PAUL

Class 227.3R Book G72
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

THE MIND OF ST. PAUL

THE MIND OF ST. PAUL

AS ILLUSTRATED BY HIS SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

BY

H. L. GOUDGE, D.D.

CANON OF ELY, AND PRINCIPAL OF ELY THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

LONDON
EDWARD ARNOLD
1911

[*All rights reserved*]

227.3R
G72

54123

OGDEN THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PREFACE

THE following lectures were delivered at the Oxford Summer School for the Clergy in July, 1911. They are published, almost exactly as they were delivered, in response to the request of some of those who heard them. Of their roughness and inadequacy to the great subject with which they attempt to deal I am very conscious. Especially do I regret that I did not deal with the contrast, which St. Paul draws in ch. iii., between the religion of law and the religion of life. But the pressure of other work seems to leave me no choice, except that between sending out the lectures as they are and not sending them out at all; and I can but think that there is very much in St. Paul's teaching in this Epistle which we all need to ponder at the present time. I am

far from supposing that I have fathomed St. Paul's mind, even about the few questions with which I have dealt, and I shall indeed be grateful if the criticism which these lectures may receive and deserve helps me to understand it better.

THE COLLEGE,
ELY,
October, 1911.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
LECTURE I - - - - -	1
LECTURE II - - - - -	36
LECTURE III - - - - -	71
LECTURE IV - - - - -	106

THE MIND OF ST. PAUL

LECTURE I

Our subject in these lectures is the mind of St. Paul as illustrated by his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. I have chosen this subject for the following reasons. The Epistle before us is one of extreme importance, both for our thought and for our practice. And yet it is not an Epistle with which it is easy to deal. It presents considerable difficulties of history and of interpretation and of literary criticism. Unlike the First Epistle, it is not arranged upon any clear plan, and so it is very difficult to grasp it as a whole. Moreover, it is too long for us, in the time at our disposal, to deal with it chapter by chapter and verse by verse. But it has seemed to me that we might gain from it much that should be useful to us in our own life and work if we

considered it simply as a revelation of the mind and heart of St. Paul in relation to that Gospel which he not only preached, but so wonderfully illustrated by his own life. This limitation of our subject will enable us to put aside much with which otherwise we should have to deal. We shall put aside, in the first place, all the critical and historical problems. It is not quite certain whether we have here before us a single letter or a collection of fragments belonging to different letters. The passage vi. 14 to vii. 1 seems strangely out of place, and certainly looks like an interpolation. Omit it, and you will find that vii. 2 follows perfectly naturally upon vi. 13. The last four chapters, again, are extraordinarily different in tone from the first nine. There is much to be said for the view that they belong to an earlier Epistle—that very Epistle to which St. Paul himself refers in vii. 8. But we shall not in these lectures be dealing with such problems as these. In the second place, we shall put aside all that refers to the special difficulties which had arisen in the Corinthian Church. Much that St. Paul says in this Epistle, he says in answer to

charges which had been brought against him. There were charges of egotism, charges of making fickle changes in his plans, charges of cunning, and many others. We feel, as we read the Epistle, that the air was thick with malicious suggestion, and that St. Paul was writing in full view of what was being thought and said about him. But we shall leave this also, for the most part, upon one side. What we shall attempt to do is to grasp the great thoughts which run through the Epistle from end to end, so as to gain, as far as we may, a clear conception of St. Paul's mind as to the Gospel of Christ and as to his own life and work in relation to it. Now that will offer us a very wide field for thought and study. There is a sense in which it would be true to say, that from end to end of the Epistle the Apostle is speaking about himself. It is, as Godet has said, his *apologia pro sua vita*. Indeed, it seems to have been one of the charges made against him that he spoke of himself a great deal too much. But St. Paul is not really an egotist. Egotism consists in a concentration of interest upon ourselves as

individuals, and St. Paul is not interested in himself as an individual at all. That would be, to use his own phrase, to 'know himself after the flesh,' and he refuses to know anyone in that way. When St. Paul thinks and speaks of himself, he thinks and speaks of himself, to use again his own phrase, as 'a man in Christ' (xii. 2), and so as sharing Christ's own profound relation both to God and to the Church. Our Lord Himself—and may I urge this point in relation to some present difficulties?—can surely never be understood, if we think of Him simply as an individual man. That, I think, is why so much critical study of His life produces results of such doubtful value. We can surely only begin to understand Him, if we remember continually both His relation to God and His relation to the Church, which is His Body. Our Lord's own tremendous self-assertion is never egotistical, never the assertion of Himself as an individual. It is simply the necessary self-assertion of One who knows Himself to be the representative of God upon earth, the predestined Head and Centre of the Divine kingdom of

human souls. And the same is surely true, *mutatis mutandis*, of St. Paul also. St. Paul never asserts himself unnecessarily. Where, as at Philippi, nobody denies his authority, he writes with simple and gracious comradeship. The first part of this Epistle is far less self-assertive than the last part for the same reason. But where it is necessary for St. Paul to assert himself, he does so with extraordinary vigour and boldness—not as an individual, but as the Apostle and ambassador and chosen instrument of God for the salvation of the world through Christ. And from this an important consequence follows. To study the mind of St. Paul about himself and his work involves the study of far more than this. It involves the study of the mind and purpose of God, of our Lord and His redeeming work, and of the whole doctrine of grace and of the Church.

'Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies;
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is.'

Those words of Tennyson are, of course, profoundly true. But if they are true of the flower in the crannied wall, they are even more plainly true of a great personality like St. Paul. In the great temple of the Church of God St. Paul is no chance-sown flower. He is himself one of the greatest of the living stones of which it is built. We cannot pluck him from the wall or hold him in our hands, for he is one of those very foundation stones upon which we ourselves are resting. But though we shall never in this world understand one who was so far nearer to God than we are, we may a little begin to understand him, and in so far as we do, we shall know God and ourselves also.

What, then, we ask, was St. Paul? Shall we take his own account of himself, and make our beginning from that? We open our Epistle at its first page, and this is what we read: 'Paul, Apostle'—not 'an Apostle,' the other Apostles are not definitely in his mind at this point—'of Messiah Jesus through the will of God.' That is what he is; he thinks of himself in no other way. Certainly there was another way in which he might have

thought of himself. 'Whereinsoever any is bold . . . I am bold also. Are they Hebrews?' —those who disparage me—'so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I' (xi. 21, 22). It was not nothing to St. Paul that he was a Hebrew any more than it was nothing to him that he was a Roman citizen. But all this was lost in what God had made him, and had ever meant to make him. Jesus, his Master, had been a Hebrew of the seed of Abraham; but he does not think of Jesus in that way now. 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more' (v. 16). 'God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified' (Acts i. 36). And it is thus that St. Paul ever thinks of Him. There is, of course, no question of any contradiction between the historical Jesus and the exalted Christ. The life of the one is absolutely continuous with the life of the other. Only we are living in the present, not in the past; we have to do with Christ as He is, and not with Christ as He was. To say with St. Paul 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more,' is

not, as some would tell us, to substitute an ideal for a reality; it is to prefer a living person to an historical reminiscence. Now, just as St. Paul is concerned with Christ, not as He was, but as He is, so he is concerned with himself, not as he was, but as he is. If Jesus, risen and ascended, is by the will of God the Christ, St. Paul, a man in Christ, sharing His risen life, is by the will of God His Apostle. It is thus only that he is to be regarded and his words received. But now what does this title mean? An Apostle, the commentator will tell us, is an authorized representative of the man or of the people by whom he is sent. But that, after all, does not carry us very far into the depth of St. Paul's meaning. The nature of apostleship depends upon the nature of the representation and upon the nature and extent of the authority entrusted to him. Epaphroditus, to take one example, was the Apostle of the Philippian Church (Phil. ii. 25). But he represented that Church only in an external way, and his authority was limited to ministering in their name to St. Paul's need. But the Apostle of Messiah Jesus does not at all

stand related to his Master in that merely external way, nor is his mission subject to the same limitations. Let us go back in thought to the greatest of all apostleships, the apostleship of our Lord Himself. That is the model which the later apostleship follows. 'As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you' (John xx. 21). Though our Lord was the authorized representative of the Father, He did not come to represent an absent God; on the contrary, He came to make God present. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.' He was in the Father, and the Father in Him, and the Father dwelling in Him did the works. So again our Lord's representation of the Father had none of the limitations of ordinary representations. All things that the Father had were His, and what was committed to Him, what God effected through Him, was the great purpose of God for men in all its length and breadth and depth and height. Now, as we saw just now, the apostleship of the Lord is the model which that of the Apostles themselves follows. They did not go out into the world to represent an absent Christ; they went out to be Christ-

bearers and to make Christ present. When the Lord said, 'as the Father hath sent Me,' He spoke in the perfect tense. He meant surely, not that His mission was finished, but that it was still to go on; through the mission of the Apostles who would bear Him to the world He would continue His work in all its greatness and its complexity. What I hope to show you is that St. Paul clearly understood his mission in that way. Certainly he preached not himself, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and himself as the Church's slave for Jesus' sake. But he did not point men away from himself to Christ, as if, when his message was once delivered, Christ would best be found by ignoring His messenger. However great our sympathy with the humility which speaks in that conception, it is not the teaching of the New Testament. It is true of the Baptist, but it is not true even of him who is but little in the kingdom. The great concern of the Baptist was, no doubt, to point men from himself to Christ, to make it perfectly clear that he was one and Christ another—'There cometh one *after* me.' He insists that he himself has no real forgiveness, no real life,

no Holy Spirit to bestow. 'What sayest thou of thyself?' they ask him. And he said: 'I am the voice'—yes, a voice, and that is all—'the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord.' But is that the example for the Christian Apostle or for the Christian ministry to-day? In humility, in self-abnegation, yes; but in any other respect, certainly no. Listen to St. Paul in this Epistle. Is he simply a voice? Has he no forgiveness, no life, no Holy Spirit to bestow? 'What I have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ' (ii. 10). The ministration of life, of the Spirit, is that very characteristic of the Christian ministry which marks it off from that of Moses (iii. 1-11). Yes, and even in judgment how St. Paul, instead of distinguishing himself from Christ, identifies himself with Him! 'If I come again I will not spare; seeing that ye seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me; which to you-ward is not weak, but is powerful in you: for He was crucified through weakness, yet He liveth through the power of God. For we also are weak in Him, but we shall live

with Him through the power of God toward you' (xiii. 2-4). So again in the tenth chapter (read verses 3-11). St. Paul never forgets his own personal weakness. He is not sufficient of himself to account anything as from himself. He 'can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth' (xiii. 8). His sufficiency is from God (iii. 5). 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God and not from ourselves' (iv. 7). But he insists, none the less, that of God he *is* sufficient, and that in him the Divine treasure of the Spirit is actually present. It is he himself who bears Christ and His Spirit to the world which needs them. As the Father is found not apart from Christ and His activity but in them, so Christ is found, not apart from the Apostles and their activity, but in them.

'In his paterna gloria,
In his triumphat Filius,
In his voluntas Spiritus,
Caelum repletur gaudio.'

So says the old Latin hymn, and most true and scriptural is its teaching. If the Father's glory was manifested in Christ, it was mani-

fested in them, His members, too. If the Son has triumphed and is still triumphing, it is in them and their work that He does so. If the will of the Spirit is being carried out, it is carried out, not apart from them, but through them. The joy of the saints springs from their activity. And if you say, 'That is sacerdotalism ; that is putting men into the place of Christ and hindering our direct approach to our Saviour,' I must reply that, call it what we will, it is this, and nothing short of it, that St. Paul teaches. And its purpose is not to obscure Christ or the Father or to hinder our approach to them, but to bring them both out of the far country of memory and devout imagination into personal contact with us in our own lives to-day, and if we condemn or reject St. Paul's language, we must condemn and reject our Lord's as well.

How, then, did St. Paul come to be an Apostle, and upon what does his authority rest? Here the great point upon which I want to insist is that, while on the one hand it rests upon a definite Divine call to the position which he holds and to the work

which he is doing, it does not rest upon that alone. It rests just as really upon St. Paul's own continual response to that call, leading as it does to his profound identification with his Master in experience and life. Now here we come to a subject, upon which I am inclined to think that a good deal of misunderstanding exists through our allowing ourselves to be the victims of a false antithesis. In our ordinary experience in the world we are familiar with two kinds of authority. There is, firstly, what we may call a purely official authority. A judge represents the King because he is a judge and for no other reason. He may be fit for his position or he may not; but from the moment when the office is his he bears the authority of that office. His acts are official acts, and are valid for that reason. It is characteristic of 'Catholics' to conceive apostolic authority as analogous to this. On the other hand, there is a representative authority which is largely or entirely personal. We can see, *e.g.*, how Nelson succeeded in inspiring his captains with his own spirit, and we can understand how, after Nelson's death, those who had

served under him and been trained by him would have a special authority of their own, because of their association with the great admiral, because they knew his mind, and because in them Nelson seemed still to live. It is characteristic of writers like Dr. Hort to conceive apostolic authority rather as analogous to this. But I want to urge that this antithesis is altogether misleading. The relation of our Lord to those whom He sends to represent Him is a relation so deep and complex, that their authority partakes of the nature of both these kinds of representative authority. On the other hand, the Apostle's authority is in a true sense official. St. Paul was 'an Apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God.' The Lord had called him upon the Damascus road. An Apostle God had made him, and an Apostle in calling and responsibility he must remain. A stewardship, as he said, had been committed to him. Woe to him if he preached not the Gospel (1 Cor. ix. 16, 17). Apostles, prophets, evangelists are gifts of the ascended Lord to the Church (Eph. iv. 11). They have His authority in their work because He has

called them to it. In the language of a far later theology, however unworthy they may prove to be, 'the effect of Christ's ordinance' is not 'taken away by their wickedness nor the grace of God's gifts diminished for such as by faith and rightly do receive the sacraments ministered unto them.' But that, after all, is only one side of the truth. If the ascended Lord calls a man to the apostolate, He forthwith sets to work to empower him, not merely by the gift of His Spirit once for all, but by passing him through the experience that is necessary for the manifestation of that Spirit and for the development of the grace of apostleship within him. If, in St. Paul's language, Christ is to 'speak in him,' then, to quote St. Paul again, Christ must be 'formed in him'—he must be 'stablished into Him' (i. 21) —and God will do it by passing him through the experience which will make him what he is called to be. From this necessity not even our Lord was exempt. The grand position which the Christ occupies in the work of God is not one which belongs to Him simply as 'the Eternal Son.' It is one which He holds as He that was dead, and behold He is alive

for evermore, and has the keys of death and of hell, because He bestows the Spirit which raises us out of them. It is because He was obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, that the Father has given Him the name that is above every name. If, on the one hand, Christship was the definite position to which our Lord was called from the first, He only attained His Christship by the experience through which by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God He was called to pass. That is one of the things which seem sometimes to puzzle the historical critic. Did Jesus, he asks, claim to be the Messiah or did He not? The evidence appears to him conflicting. But the answer is that He did and He did not. He claimed to be the One whom God had appointed to become the Messiah, but He did not claim to be the Messiah during His earthly life. St. Peter felt none of the difficulty which troubles the modern critic. He said to the Lord at Cæsarea Philippi, 'Thou art the Christ.' But he also said after the Resurrection and Ascension, 'Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made Him both Lord

and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.' The two statements are entirely consistent, the one with the other. From the first our Lord was Messiah by Divine appointment, but He only became actually Messiah by the experiences through which He was called to pass. And so, I think, it was with St. Paul. It was one thing to be called to be an Apostle, called to be a man in whom Christ Himself was to speak, and Christ Himself to forgive and to exercise discipline over His people. It was another thing to become the man in whom this wonderful purpose could be realized. That could only be through two things. On the one hand, God must pass St. Paul through the necessary experience ; on the other hand, St. Paul must yield himself to that experience with all the strain and suffering which it involved. Both of the Lord and of His servant the words were true : ' The Lord God hath opened my ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away backwards. I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair ; I hid not my face from shame and spitting.' Had it been otherwise our Lord would never have

become the true Messiah, or St. Paul a true Apostle.

Now that, surely, is at any rate one reason why St. Paul lays such immense stress upon his own personal sufferings. It is not just that he wishes to shame the Corinthians out of their disloyalty to him. It is that he wants to show how thoroughly an Apostle, through whom Christ speaks, he has come to be. Do you doubt that? Listen, then, to his own words: 'Are they ministers of Christ?' It is of his opponents that he is speaking. '(I speak as one beside himself), I more; in labours more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft.' If he glories only in the things that concern his weakness, it is because it is through his weakness that the strength of the Christ is perfected in him, and he becomes an Apostle in reality. Moreover, if we think of it, we shall see that this is only one example of a Divine method that prevails everywhere in the life of the Church. Are we Christians because we have received the sacrament of baptism? In a true sense, yes. We are called to be saints, empowered to be saints, put in the way to be

saints. But baptism means death unto sin and new life unto righteousness, and though the power for it is ours in baptism, the actual death and new life have to be realized in the life of temptation, which God calls us to endure, and through which the new life is manifested. If we wish to be indeed saints, God must bring us through the deep waters, and we must not be rebellious, or turn away backward. In so far as we stop short of the death, we shall stop short of the life. Or, to take another and more concrete example, are husband and wife one flesh because they have received the sacrament of marriage? In a true sense, yes. A husband is a husband, we Catholics insist, and a wife a wife, till death them do part, just as a Christian is a Christian, however much he may disgrace the holy name that is called upon him. But in full reality, no. The profound personal union, which is put within their reach, has to be realized through the experiences of the common life of sorrow and of joy. They are to become, in fact, what marriage in a sense from the first makes them. Now so it is with Apostleship, and indeed with every position given to us in the Church. We

err, I think, greatly, if we attempt to deny or explain away the official side of the office. There must be the distinct call upon which to look back. We cannot make the right efforts for the accomplishment of God's purpose for us unless we know, at any rate in outline, what it is that God wills us to be, and so has empowered us to be. But the representation of Christ can never be merely official like the representation of an earthly king. It must more and more come to be a representation, which rests upon the manifestation of the life of Christ within us. We come to be true deacons and true priests, only as the great Deacon, the great Priest, comes to live in us. And He can only live in us, and in the full sense act through us, as God leads us through an experience which in some far-off way reproduces His, and we accept the Cross that is to conform us to Him in all its weight and bitterness, as we daily bear about in our bodies the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our bodies. Then only it is that our activity becomes fruitful; when death works in us, life works in those to whom we go (iv. 12). And do

we not need in our controversies about the ministry to-day to lay far more stress upon all this than we usually do? Until we do justice to it, our doctrine of the Apostolic succession neither will be received by those who differ from us, nor ought to be received. In the administration of the sacraments our position is an official one, and it is nothing else. But is there any other part of our work, where that is altogether true? No one, whatever he may say, really supposes that one preacher is as good as another, or one confessor as good as another. And no one ever ought to suppose that we can issue commands, as St. Paul did, for the guidance of the Church in the new problems that arise, except in so far as Christ is living in us, as we give them. 'If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandments of the Lord' (1 Cor. xiv. 37). St. Paul was quite sure that he spoke with the Lord's authority; he was quite sure, also, that those who were Christ's would recognize that authority in him; but he never supposed that they ought to obey him, if they failed to recognize

Christ as speaking in him. The 'moral value of a mission from Christ,' to use Dr. Liddon's phrase, is immense to ourselves ; in moments of difficulty and depression we fall back most thankfully upon our sense of the definite call which God has given to us. But let us remember that our personal call cannot be to others what it is to ourselves ; others will listen to us, only as they see in ourselves the proof of it. Do not let me be misunderstood. If it is a great Christian principle that we should all willingly be subject one to another, most willingly of all ought we to be subject to those set over us in the Church. Clerical authority is real within its own sphere, just as secular authority is real within its own sphere. But do not confuse, as is so often done, clerical authority with spiritual authority. The true sphere of clerical authority is a narrow one, and we ought not even to wish to extend it, while the sphere of spiritual authority is as wide as the authority of our Lord and His Spirit, from whom it comes. In the great problems which face the Church to-day, it is not always for the Bishops to guide the Church. The Vicar of Christ, as Tertullian has taught us, is the

Holy Ghost. What we need is prophetical guidance, the guidance of those in whom Christ and His Spirit speak, and are by us recognized as speaking. It was thus, if I read the New Testament aright, that the Apostolic Church was governed. In dealing with new problems there can be no other authority that we are bound to obey. Nothing is more natural than that God should speak to us through our Bishops ; most rightly may we pray to Him to make them our prophets. But we cannot yield a blind obedience. 'Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others discriminate' (1 Cor. xiv. 29). Discrimination is our duty, as speaking is theirs.

We may seem to have wandered from our subject, but I do not think that we have wandered far. Let us return more directly to St. Paul. If, though in one sense he was an Apostle from the first, in another sense he became an Apostle through the experience through which God brought him, of what nature was it necessary that his experience should be? Now the chief, though not the only, duty of the Apostolate, as St. Paul understood it, was the proclamation of the

Gospel. The Apostle is essentially the ambassador of God, proclaiming that God has in Christ reconciled us to Himself, and beseeching us to be in deed and in truth reconciled to God. And thus his necessary experience is the experience that will fit him for this. May we not say that that experience must be, speaking broadly, of two kinds. Christ must be revealed *to* him, and Christ must be revealed *in* him. To St. Paul our Lord was revealed upon the Damascus road. Then, for the first time, he learned 'the grace'—the free, unmerited favour—'of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Then, for the first time, as he says in another epistle, did 'Jesus Christ shew forth all His long-suffering for an ensample of them which should hereafter believe on Him unto eternal life.' That revelation, it seems impossible to doubt, carried with it to St. Paul the truth of the whole Gospel which the elder Apostles were preaching. Saul the persecutor had believed that the Lord had died justly as a blasphemer, and had never risen; the Apostles were preaching that He died for the world, and that He had risen. Of the second part of their Gospel St. Paul was now assured;

so fully was the Lord risen that He had cleft St. Paul's life in twain; and if that part of the Gospel was true, the other was also. The death of Christ was what the Apostles said that it was. God had been in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. God had commended His own love—brought it out, and shewn us how great it was—in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Behind 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' St. Paul saw 'the love of God.' And that led him further still. If God had so loved him, he must yield to God and to His Christ. 'Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His Name.' 'Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost.' So St. Paul was baptized, and received the gift of the Holy Ghost. 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost'—all were his now. That was the first stage. But then, having the gift of the Holy Ghost, he was at once led

on to the second stage of his experience—the revelation of Christ *in* him. 'But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles.' The Gospel had to be confirmed to him and to others by his own experience of the Divine life within him. It was not enough that his conversation in the world should commend in a general way the Gospel which he proclaimed. That, of course, was most necessary. He has to give no occasion of stumbling in anything, that his ministration be not blamed (vi. 3); the reliability of God in the promises which He makes to us must be illustrated by the reliability of the Apostle in his own promises. If the 'Son of God' is 'not yea and nay, but in Him is yea,' then with St. Paul there must 'not be the yea yea, and the nay nay,' but the yea only (i. 18, 19). But the confirmation of the Gospel and its commendation to others by St. Paul went much further than that. Christ was revealed in St. Paul by the great moments of the Lord's experience—the death, the resurrec-

tion, the ministry to us of the Holy Ghost—being reproduced in the experience of St. Paul. Just because Christ lived in him, the sufferings of Christ abounded unto him, and his comfort through Christ abounded also (i. 5). Not only did his sufferings come as Christ's came, but they led on to resurrection as Christ's led. And not only so ; they led on to the ministry of the Spirit also. As death worked in him, life worked in his converts. I do not, of course, wish to put the servant upon the same level as the Master. What St. Paul was he was in Christ only. Yet the parallels are startling. In a real sense, St. Paul had to bear the sin of the Corinthians. Just because of the closeness of his union with them, everything that they did affected him. 'Who is weak, and I am not weak ? Who is made to stumble, and I burn not ?' (xi. 29). Just because of the closeness of his union with them, his continual resurrection meant resurrection and new life for them. 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and God of all comfort ; who comforteth us in all our affliction that we may be able to comfort them

that are in any affliction through the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God' (i. 3, 4). So the Christ revealed *to* him was confirmed and continually illustrated by the Christ revealed *in* him, and his preparation for the Gospel Apostolate was complete. Now it is with the Gospel itself, and with the Apostle's life as an expression of it, that we shall be mainly occupied in these lectures. With the Gospel we shall deal to-morrow; with the life of St. Paul as the expression of it, we shall deal on Thursday; while on Friday we shall look at the religious life of the Corinthian Church in which the Gospel and his expression of it issued. And if you are inclined to say that God's work in Christ, of which the Gospel speaks, is one thing and the Apostle's another, and that we do dishonour to God by putting them into such close connection, I can only say that St. Paul himself did not think so. He regards his own work as being as real a part of God's work of salvation as his Master's work, and passes backwards and forwards from the one to the other. Listen, and see if it be not so. 'All things are of God, who reconciled

us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation—to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation' (v. 18, 19). That word was not a mere word; it was a word illustrated by a life. And it was in great measure because it was so illustrated, we cannot doubt, that the word was with power.

Thus this whole Epistle is the Epistle of the Cross, but of the Cross as ever leading on immediately to the Resurrection. It is the Epistle of Christ's Cross. We never go more deeply into that than we do in chapter v. of this Epistle. It is the Epistle of St. Paul's Cross. We never see so fully what the Cross meant to him, and how wonderfully and fruitfully he was made to bear it, as we see it here. And it is the Epistle of the Church's Cross, and of our own. Our own Divine comfort, corporately and individually, can only be 'in the endurance of the same sufferings' which the Apostles bore (i. 6). And in all three cases—our Lord's, St. Paul's, our own—we shall see how the Cross, and the Cross alone,

leads on to the Resurrection—to the full inheritance of spiritual life in Christ, and to its mediation and expansion through ourselves to others. And I do want most earnestly to suggest to you that a return to the Cross, and to the proclamation of the Cross in word and in life, is what we most need to-day. We need it in our preaching, and we need it in our lives too. There was a time, I dare say, when the Cross was preached too exclusively and too narrowly and one-sidedly. We thought that to preach Christ and Him crucified was to preach nothing but the crucifixion of Christ and justification by faith in its intimate connection with it. When the Oxford Movement emphasized the Church and the sacraments, when Bishop Westcott and his school brought out for us the stores of truth and teaching lying hidden for us in the Incarnation, they did, we can hardly doubt, what much needed to be done. But, after all, though the Incarnation was the necessary preliminary to the Cross, and the Church and sacraments are the necessary means to the extension of its saving power, I do not see how anyone who is a real student of the New

Testament can doubt that it is the Cross and Resurrection of our Lord which were the main subjects of the Apostolic preaching. Do we not need to-day very definitely and very consciously to go back to them? Is there not a type of teaching very common to-day which practically leaves them out—a type of teaching which lays stress on the Incarnation, and upon the Church and sacraments as an extension of the Incarnation, and puts the Atonement into the background as if it were merely something which was included in the Incarnation, as if the Incarnate Lord, so to say, took it in His stride merely by being what the Incarnation made Him? That, I would urge, is not the Apostolic teaching. I do not deny for a moment the importance of our Lord's Incarnation. But is there a single passage in the New Testament where it is contemplated for its own sake? Is it not rather regarded as the first necessary step in the way of the Cross? Will you quote to me 2 Cor. viii. 9, 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich'?

Those words, I think, are very often applied to our Lord's Incarnation, but I cannot think for a moment that they apply to that alone. They apply surely to the Cross even more. The poverty lay not merely in the fact that 'though He was in the form of God,' He 'counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being found in the likeness of men'; it lay even more in the fact that being 'found in fashion as a man He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the Cross'—so poor that nothing was left to Him but a crown of thorns and the wood whereon He died. Or will you say that to St. John, at any rate, the Incarnation was primary and the Cross secondary? Will you quote 'the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us,' as to St. John the great fact upon which all else depends? Well, I should maintain that even there St. John is not thinking only of what we now understand by the Incarnation. He is thinking of the way in which the Divine Word took upon Himself the whole of our human experience—including death, its deepest

experience. The glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, which the Apostles beheld, was not merely the Divine glory shining through the Lord's human life, but even more that Divine glory shining through His human death and the resurrection which followed it. And so with the sacraments. May I venture a protest against the current teaching that the sacraments are an extension of the Incarnation? They are that, no doubt. But they are even more, an extension of the Atonement. Baptism is a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness. The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, are that Body and Blood as sacrificed for us, and now an ever-living sacrifice in the new life of the Resurrection. Back to the Cross! Back to the Cross, and to the resurrection which followed it! And if we need to go back to it in our theology, we need as urgently to go back to it in our own lives. This current teaching about the Incarnation and the sacraments not only obscures the necessity of our Lord's sacrifice; it obscures the necessity of our own. It speaks to us beauti-

fully and truly of the consecration of our human life; it bids us live it, and encourages us to live it, in Christ and for Christ. But it fails to show us that before human life can be lived in and for Christ, it must be like His, life sacrificed—life given and sacrificed not merely in intention but in fact, through that daily dying which St. Paul knew, that daily bearing of all the pain and strain that Christ our Lord lays upon us, that we may really be conformed to His likeness. Our model is not the Christ of Galilee; it is the Christ of heaven. 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth we know Him so no more.' Our model is the Christ who has died, and so is alive for evermore, the Christ who ever 'liveth unto God,' because for God He has died, and in God lives again.

LECTURE II

We thought yesterday of St. Paul himself, of the nature of his apostleship, and of the way in which he was called to illustrate and embody the Gospel, in order that his apostleship might have its full reality. To-day we will think, not so much of St. Paul as of the Gospel which he preached—of what it was, and of St. Paul's method of delivering it. It is perfectly true that the proclamation of the Gospel and the living of the Gospel are two things which stand in the closest connection. It is more or less idle to proclaim it in word unless we also proclaim it in deed. But, though that is a warning which is never out of place, it is necessary to insist upon the other side of the truth as well, and that is—I will say it boldly—that it is more or less idle to proclaim it in deed unless we also proclaim it in word. 'Our Lord's words,'

Dr. Mason has well said, 'gave articulate and explicit expression to the message of His life. What He did and was amongst men no doubt proved the most eloquent way of setting forth the truth about God. Yet as words without deeds are disbelieved, so deeds without words are misunderstood.' So it must always be. We cannot spread the Gospel simply by living it; we must also proclaim in bold and intelligible language what the Gospel is. And of the two it is the proclamation by word, and not the proclamation by deed, which normally comes first. The Corinthians who listened to the Gospel of salvation from St. Paul's lips knew at first exceedingly little about him. Whether he exemplified what he said in his life they had at first but few means of knowing. But that did not make his Gospel of none effect. No doubt, had St. Paul been an insincere man, he could not have preached it as he did 'in demonstration of the spirit and of power.' But the Gospel itself is 'the power of God unto salvation' (Rom. i. 16), when a true man of God delivers it, whether his hearers know that he is a true man of God or whether they do not. We need, I think,

to-day to trust the Gospel immeasurably more than we do. We ought to believe, almost as an article of faith, that if we can but discover exactly what the Gospel is, and then preach it just as it is, those who are prepared for it will respond to it. Let us hear St. Paul in this Epistle. 'We are not as the many, corrupting the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ' (ii. 17). These are the true conditions of success and the only conditions. We must not corrupt the word of God; we must proclaim it just as it is. We must proclaim it sincerely, believing it ourselves, and having no personal end to serve in its proclamation. We must speak as of God, with trust in our Divine mission, and confident that God Himself is speaking through us. We must speak in the sight of God, with a deep sense of His eye upon us, and we must speak 'in Christ,' living, to use for a moment theological language, in a 'state of grace,' and ourselves breathing the Christian atmosphere. But it is not at all necessary that we ourselves should be personally known to our hearers, or the character of our lives either. That

may come later, as it came in St. Paul's own case. In the first instance, preach the Gospel as it is, and leave it to have its own God-intended and God-given effect.

And now what is the Gospel? Would that we all could have heard St. Paul's own proclamation of it! That, of course, we never do, not even in the Epistle, which is so full of it. But I think that if we read this Epistle with attention we can piece it out for ourselves. That is what I shall attempt to do this morning. We will read together the most striking passage of all, and then we will endeavour to break it up into its component parts, and illustrate it from other passages in this same Epistle.

We turn, then, to v. 11. 'Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord'—the glorified Lord is on His judgment seat, and both we and our hearers must one day appear before Him—'we persuade men, but we are made manifest unto God; and I hope that we are made manifest also in your consciences.' The 'persuading' is probably here the 'persuading' of men as to his sincerity. They may have to be persuaded of it, but God knows the truth

already. We omit v. 12. That refers to the troubles at Corinth, with which we are not concerned to-day. 'For whether we are beside ourselves, it is unto God; or whether we are of sober mind, it is unto you.' That, too, refers to the charges brought against the Apostle at this particular time, but the verse has nevertheless its value for our purpose. The Gospel, we observe, filled St. Paul with a passionate enthusiasm, but it left him full of practical common sense in his apostolic activity for the Church. 'For the love of Christ constraineth us'—already we see what the great subject of the Gospel is, and how it operates as a motive—'because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died.' That is too deep a statement to be discussed by the way. We merely note in passing that the acceptance of the Gospel involves the belief in a perfectly definite historic fact and in the Church's interpretation of it. If the love that Christ has shown to us is to be the great constraining motive, we must have a definite basis for being certain of that love. 'And He died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto

Him who for their sakes died and rose again.' Here we see the moral purpose of the work of Christ and what it must involve for those who accept it. 'Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more.' This verse again has the troubles at Corinth in view. We will not dwell upon it, except to notice that the Christ with whom we are concerned in the message of salvation is not the Christ of the Galilean ministry, but the exalted Christ who died and is alive for evermore. 'Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away: behold they are become new.' We may translate 'There is a new creation,' if we prefer to do so; it makes no substantial difference. The point is that the Christian finds himself in a new world. His position, his powers, his responsibilities, his motives, the value which he attaches to material things and external advantages—all are different from what they were. 'But all things are of God.' St. Paul ever insists upon this. The Christian salvation proceeds from God, and not from ourselves. All must

be ascribed to Him as its ultimate source and ground. 'All things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation.' Two points of great importance are here. In the first place it is misleading simply to say that Christ reconciled us to the Father. If we leave that statement by itself, it may suggest an angry and hostile God, and Christ coming in as a third party to appease His anger. We should say, as St. Paul here says, that 'God reconciled us to Himself through Christ.' To this we shall return. And in the second place, notice how the redeeming work of God in Christ and the work of the Apostles are put side by side. Both are part of God's activity for us; the former would fail of its purpose without the latter. And so important are these points that St. Paul repeats them. 'To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation.' 'We are ambassadors, therefore, on behalf of Christ, as though God were intreating by us.' Our Lord, you see, is a

King who sends ambassadors. But so entirely one are our Lord and the Father that an ambassador for Christ is an ambassador for God; when Christ intreats, God does so. And the Apostle acts on behalf of both: 'We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God.' Here we have already in sight the necessity for our own acceptance of the Gospel. It is not enough that God should have been in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. We in our turn must consent to be reconciled by accepting the terms which the ambassador is instructed to offer us. And now another great statement, far too deep for us to deal with it by the way. 'Him who knew no sin'—the entire sinlessness of our Lord is essential to the Gospel—'He made to be sin on our behalf'—the Levitical scapegoat is probably in St. Paul's mind—'that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.' That, as we shall see, is a fuller statement of what we have heard already—that Christ for our sakes died and rose again. 'And working together with Him, we intreat also.' Ambassador as St. Paul is, he is not only an ambassador. He has the deepest

interest in the message he delivers, and so adds his own entreaties to his august Master's. That may not be consistent with the traditions of earthly diplomacy ; but it is entirely consistent with those of the heavenly. Though we deliver our message, 'whether men will hear or whether they will forbear,' our passionate desire must be that they may hear. 'And working together with Him we intreat also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.' St. Paul, you see, is no Calvinist. Great as is the grace which God has bestowed in the redemption of the world by Christ, real as His entreaty is that we should accept it, it is only too possible to receive that great grace in vain. 'For He saith, At an acceptable time I hearkened unto thee, and in a day of salvation did I succour thee.' These words are spoken in Isaiah to the Servant of the Lord. Our Lord in His Passion was 'heard for His godly fear,' and triumphantly succoured by the Resurrection. In His salvation, as we shall see, we have all been saved. 'Behold now is the acceptable time ; behold now is the day of salvation.' The point of contrast does not lie between the present and the

future, but between the present and the past. What St. Paul means is, not that the day of grace may soon be past and gone, but that it has no longer to be waited for. 'All things are now ready' upon God's side. We have but to accept, and our full salvation will be accomplished.

Such, then, is the fullest account of the Gospel with which the Epistle supplies us. St. Paul's immediate purpose is not to proclaim it. He is primarily engaged in justifying himself and explaining his own action. But he cannot touch upon the Gospel, even in self-justification, without at once beginning to proclaim it afresh, and there is perhaps no passage in all his writings in which we seem so clearly to hear the accents of St. Paul, God's ambassador, going from city to city in fulfilment of his mission to the world. We may need to explain his words, and to some extent to supplement them from other passages in the Epistle ; but there is, I think, nothing essential to the Gospel which we do not find in outline here.

Where then shall we begin ? Surely after St. Paul's words in verse 18 there is no doubt as to

that. 'All things are of God,' and we must begin with Him. Very characteristic it is of St. Paul to trace all things back to God. He is a true Hebrew there. Or, rather, to speak more accurately, he does not trace them back at all. He refers them immediately to God, all intermediate agencies being in comparison of no account. Let us remember this characteristic of the Hebrew mind when we read lower down that God made Christ to be sin on our behalf. We are dealing in those words with a profound mystery—God forbid that we should explain them away! But they do not tie us to any particular theory about the Atonement. They do not, for example, assert that God at any particular moment — the beginning of the Passion, or the moment of death—by a special act of His own identified the Lord with human sin. Any form of sin-bearing which we may ascribe to our Lord would by the Hebrews be ascribed to the act of God in the same way. Intermediate agencies would be in comparison nothing. And if we cannot, as indeed we cannot, say this of the action of our Lord

Himself in the Atonement, that is because our Lord and the Father are so entirely one that the action of our Lord can never be separated from the action of the Father Himself. What the One does the Other does. If our Lord died it was because the Father sent Him to die. If our Lord reconciled us to the Father, it was because God was in Christ reconciling us to Himself. There is, as you know, in Christian theology a doctrine which is called the 'Monarchia' of the Father. The Father, we are accustomed to say, is the one fount of Godhead. Our Lord is no separate God. He has nothing of His own. If He is eternal God, He is eternal God by His eternal union with the Father, by the perpetual derivation of His very being from Him. But St. Paul, true Hebrew that he is, is not much concerned with God's eternal being; he is concerned as the Hebrews ever were, with God in action. What St. Paul teaches is not so much that our Lord's being depends upon the Father's being, true as that may be, as that our Lord's action rests upon the Father's action. But, nevertheless, when

St. Paul lays stress upon the activity of the Father in the work of our salvation, he is not guarding us against the danger, so great in some Christian centuries, of putting our Lord into the Father's place, but against the far more serious danger of putting ourselves there. When in this passage he says that all things are of God, he means primarily that they are not of ourselves. So it is also in i. 21 : 'He that stablisheth us with you into Christ, and anointed us, is God, who also sealed us and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.' So it is once more in iv. 7: 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God and not from ourselves.' St. Paul, as we saw above, is no Calvinist, and no Augustinian either. But he is entirely with both Calvin and St. Augustine in their insistence that our salvation proceeds, and can proceed, from no other source than God alone.

'All things,' then, 'are of God,' from first to last. And the first lies far back indeed. God had His redeeming purpose for us 'before times eternal.' What He has done He had always intended to do. The redeeming work of our Lord

is no afterthought. God ever had His purpose to be fulfilled in Christ, and from time to time He has given to man an insight into it. How deeply St. Paul realized the age-long purpose of God, which Christ has fulfilled, comes out quite incidentally in i. 20 : 'How many soever be the promises of God, in Christ is the yea.' St. Paul is not here expounding the Gospel ; he is defending himself against the charge of fickleness of purpose. But he does this by pointing out how intolerable, and indeed unthinkable, such fickleness would be in one who is sent to proclaim a Gospel which is the standing proof of the faithfulness of God. 'As God is faithful' — that is the standard ever before his eyes—'as God is faithful, our word toward you is not yea and nay.' And it is the Gospel which exhibits this faithfulness. 'How many soever be the promises of God'— St. Paul evidently feels that they have been very many—'in Christ is the yea.' Our Lord and His work have reaffirmed and fulfilled them all.

Thus St. Paul's Gospel begins with God's eternal purpose, and with the Christ as the instrument of its fulfilment. What, then, lies in the way ? Just these two things, and

they in the closest connection—the darkness of the world and the sin of the world. God must remove both the one and the other. On the one hand, the world does not know God. It misunderstands Him in a thousand ways, and is alienated from Him; in St. Paul's splendid phrase, 'The light of the knowledge of the glory of God' has not dawned upon the world's darkness yet (iv. 6). On the other hand, there is the sin which keeps the world apart from God, and sets up a barrier against Him. And to St. Paul's mind it is sin that has to be dealt with first; the darkness will pass away of itself, as we contemplate God in His great work of dealing with our sin. St. John thought of the glory of Christ, and so of the glory of the Father, as shining out in our Lord's earthly life. That is natural enough in one who, like St. John, had witnessed that earthly life. But St. Paul had never seen this, and he never, I think, dwells upon it. The glory of Christ, of which he speaks in iv. 4, is the glory of the risen and exalted Christ. The glory of God shines out in the face of the glorified Redeemer as to-day He is, and in the Gospel which pro-

claims His glory. How, then, did God deal with sin? He dealt with it Himself, dealt with it by Himself coming down to us in Christ and dealing with it, dealt with it by that way of loving self-sacrifice which manifests His own true nature of love as nothing else can do. And observe in all this how entirely the Gospel moves on the lines of Old Testament thought. Whatever may be obscure about Old Testament sacrifice, this at any rate is clear. It is regarded as the appointment of God Himself. It is not that man recognizes the barrier which his sin creates, and devises a sacrificial system in order to remove it. It proceeds, on the contrary, from this, that God Himself recognizes the barrier, and Himself provides for its removal. Everything that is done is done by Divine appointment, and is effectual because God has appointed it to effect that which it does effect. Let me dwell for a moment upon this point. Suppose that when St. Paul told us that we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, we could have asked him the question, 'How can Christ's death reconcile us?', what would St. Paul have replied? He would have replied, I

think, 'Because God appointed it to do so.' It would not necessarily have occurred to him that we were asking the question for the satisfaction of our own minds. The true question is not how the Atonement is to satisfy our minds, but how it is to satisfy God's holiness. St. Paul might have recognized that there was an intellectual difficulty, if we had pressed it upon him, and when he was 'speaking wisdom among the perfect' he might have dealt with that difficulty. But he would not have expected unreconciled sinners to be mainly interested in the intellectual problem; he would have expected them to be interested, in the first instance, in the problem for the conscience, the problem how man is to be just before God. If the Lord's Atonement had been, so to say, an invention of our own, we might naturally have been troubled by our inability to see how it would effect its purpose. But since the Lord's Atonement was God's own act, of course it could do what God intended it to do. You see then, I hope, the force of the words, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' and how necessary it is in all preaching of the Gospel to insist upon

it. I do not mean for a moment that we are to regard our Lord as a mere instrument, with no personal share in what God has done. If that were so, there would be no meaning in speaking of the love of Christ as the great constraining motive to ourselves, or in saying that He died for all, that they which live shall no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again. St. Paul most certainly regarded our Lord as a free agent, who freely gave Himself to die for our sakes. What I do mean is that St. Paul thinks of God as Himself active in the fullest sense all through, as leading our Lord in all His redeeming activity, living personally in Him throughout it, raising Him up when the work of His death was accomplished, and through Him bestowing the spirit which causes all things to 'become new.' What the Gospel proclaims is that sin has been put away, because God, against whom it was committed, has Himself put it away, and that He has sent the ministry into the world to proclaim that He has done so.

That, then, is the main point to notice in the mind of St. Paul about our Lord's Atone-

ment—the main point upon which in our proclamation of the Gospel we have ourselves to lay stress. And if we want to go further and ask questions about the method of it, we shall not find in St. Paul any complete answer to our questions. What we do find are great hints as to the way in which St. Paul conceived of it, and as to the way in which he thought of it as operating. On the one hand, he says that 'we thus judge, that One died for all, therefore all died,' and that 'Him who knew no sin' God 'made to be sin on our behalf'; on the other hand, he says that the purpose of this was 'that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.' To put this in modern language, we may say, firstly, that our Lord, in all that He did, bore a representative character; and, secondly, that our Lord is One with whom so deep a union is possible, that we may become to God what He Himself is.

In the first place, then, St. Paul says that 'we thus judge, that One died for all, therefore all died.' Our Lord, that is to say, in His redeeming work had a representative character. He stood for us all. But let us remember as we say this (what we have seen already in

relation to Apostleship) that representation is of many kinds. Its character depends upon the character of the relation which the representative bears towards those whom he represents. The representation which is most familiar to ourselves is that of a member of Parliament. His relation to his constituents is a purely external one, and it exists simply because they themselves have given it to him. The representation of a king by an ambassador is of a very similar character. But then there is a representation, with which St. Paul was quite familiar, which is of a far deeper kind. A father is a representative of his descendants, because, whether they will or not, he involves his descendants in what he does. St. Paul would have said that, when Adam sinned, all sinned; he would have said, with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Levi paid tithe in the loins of Abraham his father. He would have said again, I think, that in Abraham's great act of faith, which was accounted to him for righteousness, all Israel believed God's promise, and so were made the chosen people of God. Nor would this have been unreal language. In calling

Abraham, in accepting the descendants of Abraham as the chosen people, God, so to say, counted upon what the example and influence of Abraham would make them. 'I have known him to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; to the end that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him' (Gen. xviii. 19). That example and influence might in part fail, and in fact very largely did fail; where it failed, it would be idle to appeal to descent from Abraham, the friend of God. It was the sharers in Abraham's faith who would be 'counted for a seed.' But, as long as the relation to Abraham was a real one, and there was at any rate the desire and the effort to imitate his faith, Abraham was a true representative, who had won immeasurable blessing for those who came after him. Now, it was in some such way as this, I feel confident, that St. Paul thought of our Lord's representation of ourselves. Whatever may be the exact meaning which we attach to St. Paul's phrase 'in Christ,' he most certainly regarded

the relation to our Lord of all those who believe and are baptized into Him as a most real and deep one; not only as real and deep as that of children to their father, but a great deal more so. And, that being so, the grand act of obedience which our Lord's death constituted, the utter repudiation of every kind of sin which it involved, the willing bearing of death, sin's penalty, was not only a death for us all, but a death in which we all died, and the resurrection by which God vindicated Him and declared Him righteous was a resurrection in which we all rose, and were vindicated and declared righteous ourselves. For that to be true of us personally our relation to Christ must be a profoundly real one. We must be incorporated into Him by baptism, and remain in Him by eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood. St. Paul's doctrine of the Atonement I believe to involve the sacramental system of the Church. 'He that stablisheth us with you into Christ, and anointed us, is God; who also sealed us, and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts' (i. 21, 22). So St. Paul speaks of the result of baptism with the laying

on of hands, one sacrament in those days rather than two. We must, moreover, see that we give to God the personal faith which He ever asks of us—that we make our Lord's utter repudiation of sin, and utter trust in God to vindicate Him and uplift Him, really our own. But if the sacramental union and the desire for, and effort after, the moral union are alike real, then we are vindicated and declared righteous in Christ; Christ's death is our death, and His rising ours. And it is thus surely we should understand the prepositions of which St. Paul makes use in verse 21. On the one hand, 'Him who knew no sin'—and in His willing bearing of death, sin's penalty, at the call of God, expressed, as never before, His utter refusal to know it—'God made to be sin *on our behalf*.' That was comparatively external, since we were not His members yet. But the purpose of it was that we 'might become the righteousness of God *in* Him,' that we might be vindicated by God, and enter into all the heritage of blessing which He has for us, not as people external to Christ—as He was external to us as He hung upon the Cross—but as those corporately

included 'in Him,' and so sharing His life. That is the mind of St. Paul. His doctrine is not an immoral doctrine any more than the acceptance of Israel for Abraham's sake was an immoral doctrine. If we do not respond to what God in Christ has done for us, it will profit us not at all. But though it is not an immoral doctrine, it is a doctrine of the purest possible 'grace,' a doctrine of God as doing for us what we could never in the very least have done for ourselves, and as only calling upon us to accept what He has done, and ourselves respond to it.

And now let us go further still, and see in what this great justification, or vindication of us, by God really consists. May I insist for a moment upon that word vindication? I need not remind you of the old controversies as to the meaning of the word 'justify.' If we ask whether it means 'make righteous' or 'declare righteous,' there can be but one answer; it means 'declare righteous.' But let us remember that to the Hebrew mind, full as it was of God in action, God's justification was not a mere legal acquittal; it was ever an act of saving power. The Divine

Judge was the Divine Saviour; the Book of the Judges is the Book of the Saviours of Israel. When the Psalmist prayed, 'Judge me, O God,' he was not asking for a legal acquittal; he was asking for a visible vindication. 'He shall make thy righteousness as clear as the sun, and thy just dealing as the noonday'—make it so, you see, not merely declare it so. So by the resurrection the Father 'justified' our Lord, not by declaring Him righteous, but by triumphantly vindicating His righteousness with a mighty Hand and a stretched-out Arm. And so, I would urge, it is with ourselves. Our own justification by God is not a mere sentence of legal acquittal; it is an act of saving power. It is here that we reach St. Paul's doctrine of the Holy Ghost. When by faith we yield ourselves up to God revealed in Christ, and are by baptism incorporated into Him, we are incorporated into Him as the Bestower of the Spirit. God justifies us by the saving act of bestowing upon us the Holy Ghost. If we read the great passage in this Epistle, in which the ministry of the Apostles is contrasted with the ministry of Moses (iii. 1-11),

we shall see that the ministration of righteousness, or justification, and the ministration of the Spirit is one and the same ministration. The contrast between the ministry of Moses, so glorious in its own way, and the ministry of the Apostles, lies just here, that while Moses ministered to men an external code of laws, which brought upon them condemnation and death, since they did not, and could not, observe it, the Apostles are ministering to men acceptance and life. But then the Apostles' ministration is the ministration of acceptance and life, because it is the ministration of the Spirit. 'If the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones, came with glory, so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly upon the face of Moses for the glory of his face, which glory was passing away, how shall not rather the ministration of the Spirit be with glory? For if the ministration of condemnation is glory, much rather doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.' You see that the ministration of righteousness—and righteousness here means vindication or justification, the opposite of condemnation—the ministration

of righteousness and the ministration of the Spirit are one and the same ministration. If we are to 'become the righteousness of God in' Christ, that is because to be in Christ, to be baptized in faith and self-surrender into Him, necessarily brings with it the gift of the Spirit. And it is here that we see why to St. Paul the resurrection, as well as the death of our Lord, was of such immeasurable importance. It is the Risen and glorified Lord, and not the Jesus of Calvary, who by the gift of the Spirit makes us what He Himself is. It is only when the corn of wheat has died, and risen, that it brings forth much fruit. That surely was where the older evangelical preaching of the Atonement used to fail, and where the Nonconformist preaching of the Atonement often fails still. Both of them take us to Calvary, and that is well. But they both tend far too much to leave us there, and that is not at all well. St. Paul never does that. He cannot, as we have seen to-day, even speak of our living 'unto Him who for our sakes died,' without at once adding 'and rose again.' And he lays, I think, this stress upon the Resurrection of our Lord, not merely because

of its evidential value, great as that is, but because it was by being raised from the dead that our Lord passes to that position of glory in which He bestows the Holy Spirit upon us, so that we 'become the righteousness of God in Him,' and 'with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit' (iii. 18). That is the full Pauline Gospel. In offering to us our glorified Lord as our means of salvation, God offers to us One who has not merely died for us, but risen again, and who bestows upon us His Spirit, that we may share His own triumphant vindication by the Father, and may become in Him all that He Himself is.

So, then, the Gospel proclaims that God has been 'in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses,' and, if we may extend the same language, that God is in the Spirit, who proceeds from Him through the Son, transforming the world into the image of His Son from glory to glory. Yes, and more than this. In so removing the sin of the world, He has removed its darkness too. In Christ,

in all that He has done in Him, in all that He to-day is as the Saviour and the Bestower of the Spirit, God's glory has shone out, so that we know at last what He is. Not only did He say from all eternity that righteousness should arise out of sin. He said also that light should shine out of darkness, and in Christ He has set up a ladder of light, by which His own glory shines out upon the world. 'Seeing it is God that said Light shall shine out of darkness'—here again all has its source in God and in the will of God—'who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (iv. 6). There is the ladder of light. At the top there is God Himself, 'dwelling in light unapproachable; whom no man hath seen, nor can see'—we cannot see God there. Just below there is the glory of God—the full shining out in His action of all that He is. That perhaps we can see a little, even apart from our Lord. 'The invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity' (Rom. i. 20). Already God

has drawn nearer to us. If we do not recognize Him—at all events dimly—we are, St. Paul says, 'without excuse.' Lower still, there is 'the knowledge of the glory of God,' and lower still, the 'light' which it brings. It is not enough that God's grace should shine out; it must so shine out that it may be grasped, and that we may know it. It is the knowledge of it which illuminates. And though that glory does shine out a little in the world, it only shines out in a way in which it is fully to be grasped by us, and fully can illuminate us, 'in the face of Jesus Christ.' It is the glorified Christ of Whom St. Paul here speaks, the glorified Christ of Whom alone it is fully true that he that hath seen Him hath seen the Father. 'I am the first and the last, and the Living One; and I was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades' (Rev. i. 18). He is the revelation of the glory of God, because in Him God has reconciled the world unto Himself by the path of loving sacrifice, and bestowed upon us His own Spirit. That is what reveals God, as nothing else has ever done.

So, then, that is the Gospel. And what we clergy have to do is to proclaim it—not, in the first place, justify it to the mind, but proclaim it. The appeal which it makes is not addressed to the mind alone, or even to the mind principally. It is addressed to the man—to the man conscious of his sin—who feels and wills, as well as thinks, and whose feeling and will are in most cases far more alive and active than his mind. That is what, if I may venture to say so, we English clergy forget. We discuss the Atonement as a problem, instead of proclaiming it as a Gospel. Time was, not so long ago, when the proclamation of the Atonement had attached to it a false and impossible theory about it, by which men's minds were so repelled that they came to reject the Atonement itself because of that attendant theory. They could not believe that God's justice was such that, provided someone was punished for the sin committed against Him, it mattered not whether it were the sinner or someone else. But that theory is now dead. We have splendid books upon the doctrine of the Atonement to-day. Moberly and Scott

Lidgett have carried on nobly the work that was begun by McLeod Campbell. When the time comes for us 'to speak wisdom among the perfect,' we have splendid stores from which to draw the wisdom that we wish to speak. But do not let us be satisfied just to re-slay the dead. The false theory out of the way, we can and ought to return to the proclamation. Moberly and Scott Lidgett do us harm, and not good, if the study of their writings leads us to explain the philosophy of the Atonement, when we ought to proclaim it as a fact to be received and welcomed, not because we understand it, but because we know ourselves to require it, and are sure that what comes home to us with such Divine power must be the very truth of God. Our first duty is to get sinners reconciled to God. We can explain the method at our leisure, and with far more hope of success, when the reconciliation has taken place. What we need is so to believe in the Atonement, that we can trust it to do its own self-commending to those whose consciences are crying out for it. There lies the great value of Dale's book on the Atonement. He does not go as deep as

Moberly; but he is full of the true missionary spirit, and so fills us with it also. I do not mean that in our proclamation of what God has done for us we are to ignore the minds of our hearers. If 'the love of Christ constraineth us,' it is 'because we thus *judge*'—judge in one way and not in another about the death which He died. Judgment is, no doubt, an intellectual process in ourselves and in those to whom we speak. The trouble is that so often we appeal to the mind and to nothing else. That was not St. Paul's way. His preaching of the Atonement was an appeal to the conscience. He did not labour the point of men's sinfulness, unless, like the Jews, they denied it. He spoke of the coming judgment with the certainty that the consciences of men would tell them that they were not ready for it, and then held up the Atonement as God's response to the need which the conscience felt. He appealed to the heart as he spoke of the love of Christ, and of God's love as revealed through His Son. He appealed to the will, telling men that Christ died for them all, that they which lived should no longer live unto themselves,

but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again. Can we not learn to do as he did? May I venture to tell you a reminiscence of my own? I remember that, when I was a curate in a great Midland town, I once asked the senior curate of the parish where I worked, 'How do you, in visiting the sick, explain the Atonement?' His reply came promptly: 'I don't explain it; I tell them that Christ died for them.' That surely was not the answer of obscurantism, it was simply the answer of common sense. Do we not all need to follow it?

That is the note upon which I would end to-day. Proclaim, proclaim! Do not be afraid of the charge of being unintelligible. St. Paul was not. 'But and if our Gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that are perishing: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them' (iv. 3, 4). That we cannot help. If a man has no affinity with the Gospel—no use for it, in our modern phrase—we shall not make him understand it, explain as we will. The simplicity of the

Gospel lies in the simplicity of the moral issue which it raises, and not in the ease with which its teaching can be explained to the hardened and the inattentive. What we can explain to them is hardly worth explaining. Be heralds. Proclaim, proclaim! God is responsible for His message, and not we, and He will justify it by its own inherent power far better than we shall ever justify it for Him.

LECTURE III

We were thinking yesterday of the Gospel which St. Paul preached, and of the way in which he commended it, not merely to the minds of men, but to their consciences, their hearts, and their wills. We saw that the Gospel, when proclaimed just as it is, is 'the power of God unto salvation.' It has a power of its own, distinct from the influence and example of the man who proclaims it, and may come 'with demonstration of the spirit and of power' from a man whom his hearers have never seen before. But though we may separate the message from the man when we do not know the man, it is practically impossible to separate them when we do know him. The Apostle must commend the Gospel to his hearers, just as in their turn those who accept the Gospel must commend it to the world. 'Ye are our epistle, written in our

hearts, known and read of all men: being made manifest that ye are an epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God' (iii. 2, 3). So we find that it was at Corinth. The conflict which was going on between that part of the Church which was loyal to St. Paul and the Judaistic, or so-called Christ-party, was not merely a conflict of opinions, it was a conflict of persons as well. And St. Paul, though with evident regret, accepts the situation, and sets himself to defend his Gospel by defending himself. How, then, does he do so? In two ways. In the first place, as I need not remind you, his defence is an historical one. It is a recital of the actual sufferings which for Christ's sake and the Church's sake he has undergone. But St. Paul does not stop short with that. He shows us the principle which underlies his suffering. The life which he is living is an embodiment of the great facts which he proclaims. Just as the historic facts which we rehearse in the Creed derive all their importance from the Divine purpose which they embodied and the Divine work which they accomplished, so the historic facts

of St. Paul's own life also derived their importance from the Divine meaning which underlay them. In St. Paul, as I have pointed out, there was a daily dying, a daily resurrection, a continual power to minister to others the Holy Ghost, and that not, of course, as a source of the Spirit separate from his Master, but because, since the daily resurrection was the expression of his Master's life within him, it naturally exhibited that power to minister the Holy Ghost which Christ in His glory possesses. Now it is with this life of St. Paul in its deepest meaning that we shall be occupied this morning. We shall not consider in detail St. Paul's account of the sufferings of his past life, wonderfully affecting as it is, nor shall we consider in detail that special and most terrible suffering, bodily and mental, which he had endured just before he wrote this Epistle. All this he who runs may read. What I want to point out is the mind of St. Paul about it and the way in which he saw in it the embodiment of the Gospel which he preached.

Now I think we shall at once have before us the main substance of all that St. Paul has

to say if we begin with some striking verses which occur just before the end of the second chapter (ii. 14-16). St. Paul is there speaking of the hurried journey from Troas into Macedonia, which he was led to take because of his unsatisfied longing to know the condition of the Corinthian Church. In the almost ceaseless travelling which his work as an Apostle involved St. Paul recognizes a divine purpose, which he acknowledges in the following words: 'But thanks be unto God, which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest through us the savour of His knowledge in every place. For we are a sweet savour of Christ unto God in them that are being saved, and in them that are perishing; to the one a savour from death unto death; to the other a savour from life unto life.' St. Paul, that is to say, is God's captive. In the exercise of His grace in Christ, God has turned the bitter enemy of His gospel into its champion and apostle. Now He leads him from place to place, from province to province of the Roman world, as the great standing proof to that world of the power of His all-conquering love. 'Faithful is the saying,

and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all His long-suffering, for an ensample of them which should hereafter believe on Him unto eternal life' (1 Tim. i. 15, 16). Nothing, St. Paul felt, had ever so shown forth the long-suffering of Christ as His dealings with himself. Wherever St. Paul went, and St. Paul's life was understood, the knowledge of the Lord could not but be manifested by him. And now the metaphor of the triumph disappears, and another and a deeper one takes its place. St. Paul is a sacrifice, a sweet savour offering to God. Do not interpret savour of the incense of the Roman triumph; never interpret St. Paul's words by Gentile ideas when Jewish ones are at hand. It is the sacrificial language of the Old Testament which is in St. Paul's mind. He is a sacrifice to God, and that not as an additional sacrifice to that of the Lord, but because the Lord's eternal life of sacrifice is being lived in him. Since it is the sufferings of Christ which abound unto him (i. 5), he is a sweet savour

of Christ unto God. Far and wide the odour spreads, 'in them that are being saved, and in them that are perishing; to the one a savour from death unto death; to the other a savour from life unto life.' That strange and wonderful career of the Apostle—how is it to be regarded? Is it death in life, or is it life in, and out of, death? Men may regard it in either way, just as they may regard the career of the Lord. How had it been with the Lord Himself? Israel after the flesh looked at Him, and they said: 'We want life, and this is death in life. We want enterprise, activity, the Romans cast out, and Israel raised to the throne of the world. If thou art the Christ, save Thyself and us. Of what use to us is a meek Christ, who will not be an earthly king and allows Himself to be crucified? That is death, not life.' They would not come to Him that they might have life, because He seemed to say both by word and deed that He had nothing but death to offer. 'If any man would come after Me, let him renounce himself, and take up his cross and follow Me.' And so, since the Lord was to them a savour of death, to death His mani-

festation led them, and the old theocracy went down in darkness and blood. But then that was not the only way of regarding the Lord. Israel after the spirit looked at Him, and they said: 'We want life, and here is life abounding—life in, and out of, death.' In Him the life of God was manifested. 'The life was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.' The Lord, as He said, lived because of the Father (John vi. 57)—not just through Him, as if He were living a life of His own for which He had to draw upon the Father's strength. That falls far short of the truth. No, He lived *because of* the Father. The Father's eternal life of self-giving lay as the groundwork underneath all that the Lord was and did. So even in death He appeared as the source of life. 'Howbeit one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and straightway there came out blood and water. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe' (John xix. 34, 35). Why was it that St. John

attached so much importance to this mysterious incident? It was surely because it showed the Lord as in some way living in and through death, and as being the source of pardon and spiritual life. To those who thus believed the Lord was a savour of life unto life. Believing in Him as the source of life, they found life themselves. Now the same was true with the career of St. Paul. It affected those who witnessed it very variously. To the ordinary Jews and Greeks of his day his life appeared a living death. That poor invalid, who had given up all, and attained nothing whose value they could recognize, was to them a savour of death. His career repelled them as death does repel and ought to repel. 'The god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them' (iv. 4). And believing that his life was but a living death, to death it led them. They were driven further from God than if they had never seen him. But that was only one result, and not the divinely intended one. To those whose sight could pierce into the truth, the career

of St. Paul was a revelation of abundant life. What struck them was that, though his life was a living death, though continually he had 'the sentence of death within himself' (i. 9), somehow the sentence never got itself executed; the daily dying never, in fact, ended in death. There was something in him which always held him up, and made him a power that neither the Greek athlete nor the Greek rhetorician ever was. And so they were immeasurably attracted; through that daily dying they themselves found life. Death worked in him, but life in them (iv. 12).

St. Paul, then, was a living sacrifice, 'a sweet savour of Christ unto God in them that were being saved, and in them that were perishing.' Do not let us fail to notice that here, as throughout, the savour is not of Christ after the flesh, but of the glorified and exalted Christ. To be a sweet savour of Christ is not the same as to be a sweet savour of Jesus, to be ever asking, 'What would Jesus do?' and so to recall continually to God and to men the humility, the strength, the loving helpfulness of the Jesus of the Gospel story. That, no doubt, in a measure St. Paul did

and we must do. But that surely is not St. Paul's meaning here. The sweet savour is that of a sacrifice—of life that has passed through death, and is filled with divine efficacy and power because it has done so—and the Christ of the Gospel story was not yet a sacrifice. Of course we may, if we will, apply to His human life sacrificial language. We may say that His whole life was a sacrifice because it was a life of continual self-giving to God for man's sake, and to man for God's. But language of that kind, true and valuable as it is, is not in fact the language of the New Testament, and our modern use of it tends, I think, to obscure to us the unique significance of our Lord's death, to represent it as merely the culmination of His life, and as having little or no significance save that which the life from the first possessed. And I must repeat that the New Testament does not allow us so to represent it. It is the exalted Christ who has passed through death, who is 'the Lamb standing, as though it had been slain,' and therefore full of divine power, and it is of this exalted Christ that St. Paul is a sweet savour to God, because, as St. Paul daily dies, so

through death the glorified life of Christ reproduces itself, and is developed within him. We will read now the passage (iv. 7-18) where this thought is especially developed, and then endeavour to understand it as fully as we may, and see how it applies to the corporate and individual life of the Church to-day.

'But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God, and not from ourselves.' The treasure is, I think, the new life of the Spirit, of which, as we saw yesterday, St. Paul is the minister, and the earthen vessels are the bodies of clay which are the instruments of the Apostles' service and sacrifice. What St. Paul has come to see is that the weakness of God's human instruments is not a hindrance to the fulfilment of God's purpose; on the contrary, it is divinely intended that God's purpose may be fulfilled the better. Divine work must be done by Divine power, and yet, in the economy of God's grace, that power can only be exercised as the human power fails. We shall understand this better presently. 'We are pressed on every side, yet not straitened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued, yet not for-

saken; smitten down, yet not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the putting to death of Jesus'—the Revised Version margin is, I think, right here, and better brings out the thought—'that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh.' This is the central thought, and St. Paul repeats it in much the same words. 'For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh.' The life of Jesus—the life of the Spirit—is present, we observe, from the outset. That is the free gift of God, which faith claims and receives. But it is one thing to have it, and another to have it manifested. That can only be, as under the strain which St. Paul's work puts upon him, his human powers break and fail, and it is left to the Divine life to hold him up. So it is that the death and resurrection of the Lord are continually re-enacted in the Apostle's experience. Just as Jesus was ever the Son of God, but was only 'declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead' (Rom. i. 4), so the Divine life was in the earthen vessel from the moment of St.

Paul's incorporation into Christ, but was only progressively declared with power as the human vessel failed. That the life which supported him was a resurrection life St. Paul knew full well (i. 8-10). 'We would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our affliction which befell us in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly beyond our power'—this was no illusion, the affliction was really beyond his human power to endure —'insomuch that we despaired ever of life; yea, we ourselves have had the sentence of death within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead, Who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver; on Whom we have set our hope that He will also still deliver us.' Thus it is that pressure on every side does not end in the narrowing of life and activity; perplexity does not end in the abandonment of the perplexing problem; the pursuit by the foe does not end by St. Paul being left in their hands; though he is smitten down, and has to fight upon his knees, the fight is still maintained. Through the pressure, the perplexity, the pursuit, the smiting down, he

dies daily; but daily through the life of the risen Jesus within him he rises to a new and fuller life. So also we read vi. 8-10: 'As deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.' Misunderstanding, personal obscurity, mortal illness, the Divine hand laid upon him for his good, sorrow, poverty, even beggary—all these things were forms of death. But each of them led on to a corresponding resurrection. He lived and did his work, not in spite of these things, but because of them. They were the means, and the only possible means, for the full manifestation of the Divine life. And now, continuing the central passage, let us see how this worked for the Church. Just as it was the Lord's glorification through death, which made possible the gift of the Spirit, so it was with St. Paul. 'So, then, death worketh in us, but life in you.' 'Most gladly' spending and being spent for the souls of others, the souls of others found life through him (xii. 15). True, no doubt, it was that since

death worked in him, life worked in him also; but St. Paul the Apostle cannot rest content with that. It was his daily resurrection which made him the minister of the Spirit. Not that the Spirit was given by him, as the Lord gave it, by communication from his own person. 'He breathed on them, and saith unto them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost.' That, of course, was not so. The Spirit, as he tells the Galatians, is given through the Apostles 'by the hearing of faith' (Gal. iii. 2). St. Paul gave the Spirit, because the depth of his experience of the power of the Lord enabled him to speak the word of God with overwhelming conviction and power, and so inspired faith, and brought men to baptism. And St. Paul proceeds immediately to speak of the basis and of the content of his own faith. 'But having the same spirit of faith, according to that which is written, I believed, and therefore did I speak; we also believe, and therefore we speak.' If you will read the 116th Psalm, which St. Paul here quotes, you will see how admirably the Psalmist's experience corresponded to St. Paul's. It is a Psalm of Divine deliverance, out of almost overwhelming afflic-

tion—a Psalm of absolute confidence in the future, and of proclamation of the Divine mercy, because the deliverance has been given. 'Knowing that He which raised up the Lord Jesus'—it was ever the power of God thus revealed which inspired St. Paul's confidence —'shall raise up us also with Jesus, and shall present us with you.' You see how simply and naturally St. Paul passes from the present daily resurrection to the future resurrection of the body which will crown it—they are only different stages in the same process; and from the present daily self-oblation to that final oblation of the whole Church to God, in which it will at last issue. Presented He will be at last in Christ His Head, but he will not be presented alone. 'For all things are for your sakes, that the grace being multiplied through the many, may cause the thanksgiving to abound unto the glory of God.' There is a magnificent sweep about this thought, of which we shall think to-morrow; to-day we leave it on one side. 'Wherefore we faint not.' St. Paul is not thinking of the upholding of his bodily and mental powers, but of the unbroken determination with which he

proceeds on his way, in spite of bodily failure. 'But though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory.' It is the glory of the Divine life, both here and hereafter, which seems almost too great to be borne, and not the passing affliction. 'While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen'—the Divine purpose, the Divine method, the Divine gift of the Spirit, and all that it is bringing. 'For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.'

And now let us look a little more in detail at this experience of the Cross and resurrection and mediation of the Spirit, which St. Paul has here described. How did the Cross come to St. Paul, and what were the main forms which it took? It came to him just as it came to his Master, not through his share in the ordinary pain and sorrow of the world, or through any self-chosen suffering, but simply through the performance of the task laid upon

him, in spite of the natural weakness which might have seemed to unfit him for it. In a perfect world, it may be, our tasks would be adapted to our natural powers. They would but call out, develope, and perfect those powers, and make for perfect health both of body and of mind. But in a world of sin that cannot be. In the sweat of our brow we must eat bread. The penalty of sin is not work, but overwork, and so the Cross comes. But then we do not realize all this at first. I suppose that there is no expression which we use more loosely than the expression 'to bear the Cross.' We speak of the ordinary trials, which 'the children of this world' have to bear as well as we, as our crosses. Or, again, if our lives are easy, we think that we must invent crosses for ourselves if we really desire to be like our Redeemer. No doubt there is truth in both these views. There is no trial which ever comes to us which we may not bear in the spirit of the Cross. The Cross did not come to the penitent robber because he had followed Christ, but because he had not followed Him; his cross was the cross of this world only. But he transformed it into the Cross of Jesus

by the humility with which he accepted it, and the patience with which he bore it in fellowship with our Lord. So, also, self-imposed sufferings—fasting, and other forms of self-discipline—have a real place in the Christian life. But neither the one nor the other of these forms of suffering is in itself the Cross. The crosses of this world did not, as far as we know, fall more heavily upon our Lord than upon other men. Apparently he never knew illness or any crushing bereavement; certainly He never knew the disappointment of earthly hopes, since He had none for the world to disappoint. Nor was it ever our Lord's way to lay suffering upon Himself. The Cross came to Him in that, just as He was, in all His human weakness, He set Himself to carry out the whole task which the Father laid upon Him—'not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many.' He did not seek for the Cross, He sought the accomplishment of the Father's purpose. He did not seek to suffer, He sought simply to obey, and the Cross came to Him in body as well as in mind and spirit, because He did so. When the Lord said in

the Garden, 'The spirit, indeed, is willing, but the flesh is weak,' He thought no doubt chiefly of the bold protestations of devotion which the Apostles had made, as contrasted with their immediate failure when real fellowship was asked of them. But the words described His own experience, as well as theirs. What we see in the Garden is the breakdown of the human powers of our Lord under the strain which they were called upon to bear. It was just as true, to quote St. Paul's words in this Epistle, that 'He was crucified through weakness,' as that after the Resurrection He lives through the power of God (xiii. 4). And St. Paul's experience corresponded to the Lord's. He, too, as far as we know, had no special share in the ordinary trials of the world. He, too, as far as we know, never imposed trials upon himself. He took his part, of course, in the fasts of the Apostolic Church, but that was as far as he went. If we interpret his words in 1 Cor. ix. 27 about buffeting his body and bringing it into bondage as a reference to anything like hair-shirts and disciplines, we greatly, I think, misinterpret them. St. Paul in that passage has been

speaking of his Apostolic labours. He buffeted his body and brought it into subjection by the severity of the labours which he imposed upon it, and by forcing it to be the slave of the Divine work with which he had been entrusted. No, the Cross came to St. Paul just as it came to his Master, simply because he set himself to obey, because he faced the whole call which God gave to him, and set himself to carry it out, in spite of his human weakness.

Let us consider for awhile the nature of God's call and the natural weakness of the man upon whom it was laid. St. Paul, as we know, was sent to be the first great pioneer missionary, the first preacher of the Cross to the heathen world. What an iron frame, what a splendid convincing eloquence would have seemed to be necessary to make such a call for a moment reasonable! And what was St. Paul? St. Paul was a man frequently prostrated by some severe illness—what, we do not know—but by some illness which he felt made him a repulsive spectacle to those among whom he lived. How does he write to the Galatians? 'Ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the Gospel

unto you the first time ; and that which was a temptation to you in my flesh ye despised not nor rejected ; but ye received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus ' (Gal. iv. 13, 14). The temptation which St. Paul's bodily illness offered the Galatians resisted, but the temptation was ever present to those who were near St. Paul, and it was not always as well resisted. What said the Corinthians, with their love of physical beauty ? ' His bodily presence is weak ' (x. 10). And St. Paul felt that this really mattered, as indeed it did matter. He seems, for example, before the writing of this Epistle, to have been prostrated with illness at Ephesus, when his presence was urgently needed elsewhere. But he tells us that his Lord distinctly refused to give him the health and strength which he seemed to require. ' Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me. And He hath said unto me '—evidently there was something final about the way in which the message came—' My grace is sufficient for thee ; for My power is made perfect in weakness.' And the true conclusion at once follows. ' Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in

my weaknesses, that the strength of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake; for when I am weak, then am I strong' (xii. 8-10). St. Paul saw another purpose in his 'stake in the flesh' beside this; it was given to him that he 'should not be exalted overmuch' by the greatness of the revelations made to him (xii. 7). But its greatest purpose was surely the one upon which we are especially dwelling to-day, that the Divine life within him might be manifested in power as the human strength failed.

Thus far, then, as to the weakness of his bodily presence. Will you think me immeasurably presumptuous if I go on to speak with equal plainness about what the Corinthians described as the contemptibility of his speech? 'His bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible.' Such words, of course, could only be used by enemies, and these very undiscerning enemies. St. Paul's speech is by no means contemptible. But had he at all the power which would seem to have been necessary if he was to fulfil the task which

the Lord gave to him? There are writers who are fond of praising St. Paul 'after the flesh,' of admiring his wide culture, his statesmanlike outlook, his resistless logic, and what not. Perhaps the fault lies in my own vision, but if all these things were in St. Paul, I am afraid that I have not discovered them. Two or three familiar quotations from the Greek poets are 'learning's crumbs' indeed. He was guided, St. Luke tells us, in his choice of his spheres of work not by any statesmanlike vision of the conversion of the empire, but by the direct, and sometimes unexpected, guidance of the Spirit of God (Acts xvi. 6-8). The resistless logic, if it is there, is not always quite easy to follow. And then, as to his speech, I must confess, I fear, to some amount of sympathy with the Corinthian criticism. The depth and beauty of St. Paul's thought are beyond words. 'Though I be rude in speech, yet am I not in knowledge; nay, in everything we have made it manifest among all men to you-ward' (2 Cor. xi. 6). There are places, and many places, where the depth and beauty of the thought seem to force the expression into conformity with them. And,

more than this, we can believe St. Paul entirely when he says that he speaks of the things that are freely given to us by God, 'not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth' (1 Cor. ii. 13). Surely the old much abused expression 'verbal inspiration' is not at all too strong to apply to the expression which St. Paul gives to the truth of God. But when we pass from the Divine to the human element in St. Paul's speech, have not the Corinthians a case? Judged by any merely rhetorical or logical standard, St. Paul is far indeed from being a good writer. It is not merely that his style lacks the ornament which the Corinthians desired; had he won the admiration of the Corinthian rhetoricians he would probably have been intolerable to us. There are more serious charges to be made than this. For a writer who knows so exactly what he means, St. Paul is extraordinarily obscure. His sentences, for example, are frequently far too long, so long that we have forgotten the beginning long before we come to the end, while occasionally so has he. His thought is at times so closely packed that it is most

difficult to unravel ; he mixes his metaphors ; he goes off at a tangent into something off the main line of his thought ; he seems at times to have no notion of arrangement. This very epistle is in this respect so extraordinary that very many cannot believe that even St. Paul can have written it as it stands. Compare the style of St. Paul, I do not say with the pellucid clearness and beauty of our Lord's in the Synoptic Gospels, but with the strong nervous prophetic style of St. James, and St. Paul's inferiority is surely abundantly manifest. And observe that, as in the case of his illness, this weakness 'after the flesh' really mattered. He tells us, indeed, that 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God' (1 Cor. ii. 14), and that if his 'gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that are perishing' (iv. 3). That those who are destitute of the Divine light, and who have no sympathy with the Gospel, should fail to understand the Gospel is, of course, only to be expected ; St. Paul's style is in no way to blame for that. But the spiritual man, who has the fullest sympathy with St. Paul's mind, also finds his words very difficult, and

that not simply because of their depth, but because of their real obscurity. I believe it would be true to say that, as far as our evidence goes, nobody in the ages after the Apostles understood St. Paul until St. Augustine, and even he understood him most imperfectly and one-sidedly. And the difficulty remains still. 'Unto this day, whensoever' St. Paul 'is read, a veil lieth upon' the minds of our people, and our best attempts at explanation do not altogether take it away. What then are we to say to these things? I suppose we are to regard St. Paul's weakness in this respect as just as much divinely designed as his bodily weakness. To ourselves it constitutes a 'temptation,' as his illness did to the Galatians. God tests us by St. Paul's obscurity to see whether we are willing to make the effort and exhibit the patience which the understanding of St. Paul requires; we cannot say that we are not richly rewarded if we pass the test. And to St. Paul himself, this rudeness of speech, which never entirely passed away, was one of the means whereby the strength of Christ rested upon him. It kept him humble and dependent upon God,

and though human eloquence might fail him, somehow the Divine life and light within broke through the imperfections of his language, and 'the exceeding greatness of the power' was, and was seen to be, of God, and not from himself. 'I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God' (1 Cor. ii. 4, 5).

May I venture, brethren, though with some diffidence, to say a few words to you as to what all this seems to me to mean for us to-day? Do we not all, corporately and individually, need to understand better than perhaps we do the conditions of the manifestation of the Divine power in our ministry? I do not think that we regard our work in any carnal way. We do not suppose that Divine work can be done by merely human power; that would be as absurd as to suppose that we could do intellectual work with our muscles. We know quite well that what we need is the Divine power, and we do ever pray

'Come, Holy Ghost.' We look at the mighty organization of the Church of England, and we grieve over the little that we seem to effect, and we cry out for a new baptism of the Spirit to give a power to our work which at present it does not possess. All that is well, and must be pleasing to the God whom we serve. But do we understand fully what the conditions of the Spirit's activity are? There was a time, no doubt, when 'the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified' (John vii. 39). There was a time, too, though but a short time, when Jesus was indeed glorified, but the Church was still tarrying in Jerusalem until it should be 'clothed with power from on high' (Luke xxiv. 49). But both the one time and the other have passed away, never to return. It is idle to speak of waiting for a fresh baptism of the Spirit. We have, in St. Paul's language, 'the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts'—all of His presence, as far as the Divine bestowal is concerned, which in this world we shall ever have. In the ancient world the 'earnest,' the part paid on account, was not a small part of the whole; it was a large part, more than

half the whole sum. We shall have no more until the day comes for 'the redemption of the body.' What we lack is not 'the life of Jesus,' the life of the Spirit—that we have already. What we lack is its manifestation 'in our mortal flesh,' corporately and individually. And the way to that is the way of the Cross, the 'bearing about in the body the putting to death of Jesus,' and it comes, as we have seen, not by any self-chosen discipline, but by the simple facing of the whole task which God lays upon us—physical, intellectual, and spiritual—and the setting of ourselves, just as we are, to accomplish it. Do let us understand that it is not God's intention that we should be adequate to our task ; it is His intention that we should be inadequate—not strong enough, not clever enough, not sufficiently learned, not statesmanlike enough, to have any chance of accomplishing it. If 'His Divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness,' it has certainly not granted them to us as 'men known after the flesh,' but only 'through the knowledge of Him that called us by His own glory and virtue' (2 Pet. i. 3). To know

Him as He is, is to know Him as the One who is living out of death, and knowledge implies conformity to His example. We shall only attain to the manifestation of His life within us, if we do not choose our own tasks, the tasks we think adapted to our strength, but accept the tasks He gives us, tasks not adapted to our strength at all. I do not, of course, mean that we are not to try to become as adequate as we may; God can use all that we give to Him. St. Paul himself turned to account even so trifling a fact as his Roman citizenship. Only do not let us expect to be adequate before we begin. 'Who,' as St. Paul says, 'is sufficient for these things?' God can make us sufficient; in a sense, He has made us sufficient already; but only by a gift of Divine life, which is merely latent until we require it. It will remain latent until the human strength breaks under the strain; we must die if we want really to live. 'Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake; for when I am weak, then am I strong.' But is not this what we forget? We count it strange if there is any fiery trial among us,

as though a strange thing happened unto us, quite forgetting that it is only as we bear it that the spirit of glory and the Spirit of God rests upon us (1 Pet. iv. 12-14). We think that if the outlook for the Church is menacing, the Church must be made safe before we can do our work. We put our strength into getting ready for our work, instead of putting our strength into doing it. We take no pleasure in infirmities, and so we try to remove them from the Church and from ourselves. We take no pleasure in reproaches, and so we think we must successfully defend the Church against all the charges made against her. We take no pleasure in necessities and persecutions and distresses, and so we think that the Church must have all that she seems to require for the doing of her work—an established position and adequate endowment, and a sufficient body of trained clergy, and the command of the schools —and then we will begin in good earnest. How differently He taught us who said, 'I thirst'! Never did He do God's work better than when He was upon the Cross. Let us have all these things if they come, and make the best use we can of them. But if God has given us our

task, we must do it now, and do it as we are. The Church is always in a crisis, and always will be. Difficulties, limitations, insoluble problems—we do not do God's work in spite of these things; they are the only means by which we can do it at all. We can only do God's work if we bear the Cross sufficiently for the Divine power to be manifested in us. So it is, also, in our own individual lives. We cannot choose the task adapted to our powers; we must deal with the task that is there:

> 'We in part our weakness know,
> And in part discern the foe.'

Yes! only in part, and the foe even less than our own weakness. But the Lord hurls the thin line of His followers in a frontal attack against the whole position of the enemy, and though we fall, we shall arise. But once more, how we forget it! We want so much before we begin. Adequate learning, adequate provision for our needs, adequate holiday, a perfect security that we shall not endanger our health—then we will begin. Christ did His work first, and then spoke of His need. 'After this Jesus, knowing that all things

are now finished, that the Scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst!' But we speak of our thirst at the beginning, and somehow, so thirsty are we, that before we have quite satisfied it, the night cometh, when no man can work. If we suffer, we shall have an influence; if we do not suffer, we shall have next to none. It is the stricken rock out of which the water comes. 'Now, on the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying: If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink. He that believeth in Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' It is not very certain to what Scripture our Lord refers. But the words seem best explained of the rock which Moses struck, and out of which the water flowed for the quenching of Israel's thirst. And if we so interpret them, then our Lord calls us all to become ourselves stricken rocks, out of which the Spirit may flow to quench the thirst of the world. If only sufficiently we allow death to work in us, life will work in those to whom we go. 'Pressed on every side, yet not straitened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued,

yet not forsaken; smitten down, yet not destroyed.' That is the Christian way. Always with more work than we seem able to do, always with more opposition than we seem able to meet, always with harder problems than we seem able to solve, never seeing how everything is going to be done, and yet, somehow, when the time comes, doing it. So we become to God a sweet savour of Christ, the eternal sacrifice, in them that are perishing and in them that are being saved. And since God means all men to be tested by the vision of the Christ, whether we are a savour of death unto death or a savour of life unto life, we do His work and accomplish His purpose.

LECTURE IV

We have been occupied in these last three lectures with the study of the Pauline Gospel, and of St. Paul himself, as the Apostle and interpreter of it. To-day we shall be thinking of the character of that Christian life which resulted from acceptance of his Gospel, and from the gift of the Spirit that followed it. I suppose it would be true to say that those who have, in the last few centuries, laid most stress upon the Pauline Gospel of salvation have, for the most part, understood it in too individualistic a way, and so have generally undervalued both the corporate side of the Christian life, and the sacraments by which that corporate life is expressed and sustained. It is partly, I think, for that reason that in our own generation the Pauline Gospel has so largely receded from view. After so much individualism, a reaction was inevitable, and

a reaction has certainly come. Wild and whirling words are sometimes spoken, not merely against misrepresentations of St. Paul's Gospel, but against that Gospel itself, because it is supposed to lead us to be engrossed in our own individual salvation, instead of leading us to merge our individual lives in the larger life of the body of which we are members, and in which alone we can be our fullest and truest selves. But this objection certainly arises from a misapprehension of St. Paul's meaning. So far from St. Paul being an individualist, he is sometimes reviled as the inventor of Catholicism. Certainly, if we want to defend the Catholic doctrine of the Church and of the Sacraments, it is to his writings, rather than to any others, that we shall turn. Of course, it is his later writings, such as the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians, which mainly emphasize the corporate side of Christianity. While he was engaged in controversy with the Judaizers, he had especially to insist upon the necessity for individual faith. Dependence upon membership in the chosen people of God, without effort to exhibit that consecration to God,

upon which its whole position depended, was precisely the evil which he had to combat; and to insist upon the necessity of individual faith was the way to combat it. But there never was a time when St. Paul was an individualist in religion; he was always essentially a member of a body, to be understood by his relation to that body, and the result of his work was not to make Christian individualists, but Catholic Churchmen, remembering ever their relation to the whole Church, and acting upon it. St. Paul never either sacrifices the individual to the supposed interests of the body, as the lower kind of Catholicism does; or the body to the supposed interests of the individual, as the lower kind of Protestantism does. He does splendid justice to both. It is this aspect of the mind of St. Paul that I desire to exhibit this morning.

Now, in dealing with this subject, the first thing to be noticed is this. The whole Pauline Gospel is, as we have seen, bound up with the idea of corporate blessing. St. Paul's proclamation of the Atonement presupposes that all Christians possess so real a corporate unity

in Christ their Head, that what He has done, in a sense they have done also, and what He has obtained belongs also to them. The Christ of God, we may truly say, in His work of redemption, did nothing for us as individuals. If we maintain an exclusively individualistic religion, the doctrine of the Atonement at once falls in ruins. Our Lord neither represented us as individuals, nor was substituted for us as individuals, nor did anything for us as individuals whatever. On the contrary, in all that He did, He acted for us in our corporate unity as the Church His Body. The conception of the Church as the Body of Christ does not, as far as words go, appear in the Epistle with which we are dealing, but it is obviously presupposed when St. Paul says that 'since One died for all, therefore all died.' It is perfectly true that our own share in all that He has won for us depends upon our own individual faith; upon that we shall dwell almost immediately. But, nevertheless, we do not receive blessing as individual believers, but as the members of Christ. What the Father has bestowed upon us He bestowed, in the first instance, upon Christ, and upon Christ

alone. The great vindication of the Resurrection, the glorification by the Ascension, the rule with the Father upon His throne, the power to bestow the Spirit—all alike were given, in the first instance, only to our Lord. We ourselves share in them simply as His members —as members, with others, of the Divine kingdom of which our exalted Lord is the Head and centre. And, in a similar way, whatever response we may make to the grace of God, and to the promises which, in Christ, He makes to us, we do not make primarily as individuals; we make it as taking our own part, as the members of Christ, in the perfect response which Christ has made, and ever makes, to the Father and to His promises. So we read chap. i. 20: 'How many soever be the promises of God, in Him is the yea: wherefore also through Him is the Amen, unto the glory of God through us.' On the one hand, all the promises of God are reaffirmed in Christ, and in Christ and His work find their fulfilment. On the other, whenever our own Amen claims these promises —whenever we say: 'That promise for me, and that promise also for me,' we claim them not as

isolated individuals, but as the members of Christ asking in His name, and heard because we are found in Him. That response to God's offer may vary greatly in different people, and in the same people at different times, and as the response, so will the blessing be. But whatever the response, it is always a response in Christ, and wins blessing because it is so. And not only is this, in fact, the mind of St. Paul, but he could not, without a revolution in thought—of which there is no trace—have thought in any other way. All ancient religion is primarily tribal and corporate, though personal religion may arise out of it. No Hebrew ever supposed that he could share the Divine blessing which belonged to his nation, unless he maintained his union with his nation. 'To Abraham and to his seed were the promises given.' God, in the first instance, had called Abraham alone; He had bestowed His blessing upon Abraham alone. The great response of faith had been made in the first instance by Abraham alone. The individual Israelite could not share in Abraham's promises unless he maintained his connection with Abraham. If he was 'cut off from Israel,' he

could not share in Israel's blessing. Thus, on the outer side of his life, he must be circumcised ; he must keep the Passover ; he must take his own share in the religious life of his nation ; and, on the inner side, he must accept the moral obligations of Israel, and respond to God's purpose in calling it. What the Old Testament prophets thunder against is not the idea that the connection with Abraham is of immeasurable importance, for that they hold themselves ; it is the idea that that connection can be of any practical value, while the whole spirit and attitude of Abraham is being in practice repudiated. It is the faithful remnant who will inherit the promises, and they alone. As for the rest, 'Abraham is ignorant of them, and Israel acknowledges them not.' If the land is not to be smitten with a curse, this alienation must be removed. There must be a new Elijah to turn the hearts of the old fathers towards their degenerate children, and the hearts of the degenerate children towards their fathers (Mal. iv. 6). So it is also in the teaching of the last of the prophets of the old covenant, the Baptist himself. When he says that God is able, of the stones of the desert, to

raise up children unto Abraham, so far from denying the value of sonship to Abraham, he distinctly asserts it. His point is that God's promises are not tied to Abraham's present descendants; nothing is easier than to raise up others who will be more like him. Now to this the teaching of St. Paul exactly corresponds. Nothing is further from his intention than to substitute for the corporate religion of the Hebrews an individualistic religion of his own. His teaching is not that Abraham has no heirs, and that everybody stands before God upon his own individual basis, but that the true heirs are those who share Abraham's faith. He was 'the father of all them that believe, though they be in uncircumcision, that righteousness might be reckoned unto them; and the father of circumcision to them who not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had in uncircumcision' (Rom. iv. 11, 12). And I need not remind you that, so far from admitting that in so teaching he is an innovator upon the ancient faith, he insists, with the utmost wealth of quotation, that God's purpose, as expressed in

the Old Testament, was always this and nothing else. 'For I say that Christ hath been made a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, that He might confirm the promises given unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy; as it is written, "Therefore will I give praise unto Thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto Thy name." And again he saith, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people." And again, "Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and let all the peoples praise Him." And again, Isaiah saith, "There shall be the root of Jesse, and He that ariseth to rule over the Gentiles; on Him shall the Gentiles hope" (Rom. xv. 8-13). To St. Paul Christianity is no new religion; it is simply the old religion, with all its promises fulfilled, or on the eve of fulfilment, through Messiah's coming. 'How many soever be the promises of God, in Him is the yea.' Christ makes no new promises; God makes no new promises through Him; reconciliation, vindication, the outpouring of the Spirit—all these things have been promised long ago, and Abraham and his seed have always been expecting them. And this old religion remains as corporate as it has

always been. There is no inheriting of God's promise, except by belonging to the Israel of God, and being children of Abraham. In the language of a later theology, 'Extra ecclesiam nulla salus'; you cannot have God for your Father, unless you have the Church for your mother. And this Church, be it observed, out of which there is no salvation, is not a new Church, but the old Jewish Church. St. Paul knows no other. If you are not a member of the chosen people of God, you have no share in the salvation promised to it.

I have put this as strongly and as paradoxically as I can, because I believe that it needs putting in that way if we are to understand what the mind of St. Paul really is. Let me now deal with the objections which you will naturally urge against it. These objections will probably take two forms. You will say, on the one hand, that I am ignoring what is as plain as the day in all St. Paul's writings, the absolute necessity and sufficiency of faith in Christ and self-surrender to God as revealed in Him; and you will say, on the other hand, that I am confusing the Jewish Church with the Christian Church, and

assigning to the one the position which only belongs to the other. Let me deal with these objections one by one. My answer to the first will be, that I am not at all ignoring the necessity and sufficiency of faith in Jesus Christ. I am simply expressing the mind of St. Paul about them. My answer to the second will be that I do totally repudiate the distinction which you wish to urge. I believe that there is one Church, and only one —the Church of Abraham and his seed—and that there never has been, and never will be, any other.

Firstly, then, with regard to the immeasurable importance of faith in Jesus Christ. St. Paul speaks little of faith in this Epistle, though he tells the Corinthians that it is 'by faith' that they 'stand' (i. 24), and evidently implies that it is by faith—the heart of Israel turning to the Lord—that the blessings of the new covenant became our own (iii. 16). St. Paul here awakens faith in the best possible way, not by speaking about faith, but by speaking about God, about our Lord, and what They have done for us. But, of course, in other Epistles he says a great deal about faith. And

what is his teaching ? Not that faith is a new demand, which marks the beginning of a new religion, but that it is an old demand, the old characteristic demand of God, and that thus the demand for it marks the fact that the old religion is going on without a break. That is the whole point—is it not ?—of the discussion of Abraham's faith in the Epistle to the Romans. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. We, too, are to believe God, and it will also be accounted for righteousness to us. And more than this, what God has asked us to believe has always been precisely the same thing. He has asked us to believe in His own power to bring life out of death. If you read Rom. iv. 16-25, you will see this clearly. The eternal object of our faith is 'God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth the things that are not as though they were.' The first great example of faith is Abraham, who 'considered his own body now as good as dead and the deadness of Sarah's womb,' and yet, 'looking unto the promise of God, wavered not through unbelief, but waxed strong through faith, giving glory to God, and being fully

convinced that what He had promised He was able also to perform.' And the form which faith must take in our own case is to 'believe on Him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.' You see that it is in His own power as quickening the dead that God ever calls us to believe. In the case of Abraham, God's call to faith was the call to believe that from him as good as dead an innumerable seed would arise. In the case of the great deliverers of Israel, God's call to faith was the call to believe that, through the power of God, from them as good as dead salvation would arise to their people. In the case of the great prophets of Israel, God's call to faith was the call to believe, that through their corrupt and prostrate nation, though not through it as still in its corruption, God's great purpose would yet be fulfilled; He would make the 'dry bones live.' In our case God's call to faith is the call to believe that God has raised our Lord from the dead, and to believe it, not simply as an historical fact, but as a fact in the most intimate connection with our own salvation, since the

One whom God then raised up was the One who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification. This act of faith may be described in many ways; we may speak of it as believing on the Lord Jesus (Acts xvi. 31), since Jesus is our Lord by the resurrection; we may speak of it as believing that God raised Him from the dead (Rom. x. 9); we may speak of it as believing that Jesus is the Son of God (Acts viii. 37), since it was by the resurrection of the dead that He was declared to be the Son of God with power. But in all these forms of expression the essential meaning is the same. We believe that God has given life out of death to our glorified Head, and that in Him and through Him He will give life to us. And we are baptized as the expression of that faith. We are incorporated into Christ, that His dying unto sin and His great vindication or justification by the resurrection may become our own, and we ourselves receive life from God who gives life out of death, here and now in our spirits, and hereafter in our bodies as well. 'Knowing that He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also with Jesus, and shall

present us with you' (iv. 14). In all this we are not separating ourselves from the corporate religion of the Old Testament, but steadily adhering to it. Baptism, before our Lord's coming, was the means of incorporation for Gentiles into the Church, and it remains, in spite of the fuller blessing attached to it, the means of incorporation into the Church still. We are giving to God by our faith what God has ever asked, and seeking from Him what He has ever promised. We are joining a body, and adhering to a body, that we may have our own share in the blessings pledged to that body. And if Christ has to us taken the place of Abraham, and far more than filled it, He has filled it as being Himself Abraham's seed, to which the promises were made, and in which they find their fulfilment.

And now to turn to that identification of the Jewish with the Christian Church, upon which I wish to insist. I do not regard it as of any doctrinal importance; it is simply a question of the language we employ. But I do want to urge that the distinction we are accustomed to draw is not justified by the New Testament, and that it inflicts real loss

upon us by cutting us off from our glorious spiritual ancestry in the Old Testament. The Jewish Church and the Christian Church are one; the Jewish Church was ever intended to become Catholic, and the Catholic Church is nothing but the Jewish Church come to its full stature. Let me begin with a clear example of this. The woman clothed with the sun in Rev. xii. is the Church, and she is at one and the same time the Jewish Church, who is the mother of the Messiah, and the Catholic Church, who is persecuted after the Messiah's ascension. I do not at all think that that is merely a peculiarity of Johannine symbolism. We speak indeed continually to-day of our Lord as founding the Church ; we even speak of its being the purpose of His coming to found it. But where does He use such language? He tells us that He came to seek and to save that which was lost, and that He was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Both expressions imply that His purpose in coming was to fetch men home to the Church already existing. Will you quote to me: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My church'? Will you say that

our Lord here distinguishes His own Church from the Father's Church of the Old Testament? But how can that be so? Is it conceivable that our Lord, who ever traces every word and deed of His to the Father, could distinguish between the Father's Church and His own? Surely they must be one and the same. To build the Church does not imply that it never has been built before. Let us listen to St. James as he speaks of the entry of the Gentiles into the Church, and of the Old Testament anticipation of it: 'To this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After these things I will return, and I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called.' It is the old Church of Israel which is to be built, and not a new one. Nor is it at all true that our Lord speaks of St. Peter as the first stone to be laid in the new structure. There is not a word of St. Peter being laid at all; he is there already. Our Lord has been digging down to the rock, as He tells us that we must

do if we wish to build securely. Where He finds faith, the fundamental characteristic of God's people from the first, there He finds the rock upon which He can build. We may regard St. Peter as the rock upon which all the rest of the building will be reared in the future, or we may regard him, in accordance with other passages of the New Testament, as only a part of it. But, in either case, as the Lord digs down through the ruins and drifting sand with which the old building of God has been overlaid, He recognizes St. Peter as rock which may be part of the permanent building. Or consider the passage in St. Matt. xviii., where again our Lord speaks of the Church. What Church is it before which the sin of the erring brother is to be brought? It cannot be the local Jewish community as distinct from the Christian—how could Christians refer their differences to that? And yet no other church was yet in existence. Is it not simplest to suppose that our Lord does not recognize the distinction? The Christian community and the Jewish community are one, just as they were when St. James wrote his Epistle. And with this surely

agrees the general New Testament conception of our Lord's own place in the Church. In one place, and in one only, He is described as the one foundation ; but there it is a question —is it not?—largely, if not entirely, of the subject of Christian teaching. The normal representation, repeated again and again, is that He is the head corner-stone rejected of the builders, but chosen of God and precious. And that representation presupposes a building which has been rising long before His appearing, and which His appearing completes and crowns. I do not at all wish to overpress a metaphor. What I do protest against is our allowing ourselves to be browbeaten by the mere numbers of the unbelieving Jews into supposing that they, and not we, are the true descendants of the patriarchs and prophets, while the Catholic Church is a new body which has taken their place. 'He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh ; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter.' If I am a believer in Jesus Christ, then I am a Jew, a sharer in the root

and fatness of the good olive-tree. When I sing in the Benedictus about my forefather Abraham, I mean what I say. Abraham belongs to me, and not to the Jews, who have been broken off because of unbelief; I claim the family portraits. Of course, since the coming of the Messiah many things have been changed in the Church of God. We Jews do not now observe the old distinctions of meat, since our Messiah purged all meats. We do not now observe the Passover, since our Messiah has given us a far greater deliverance to commemorate in our Christian Eucharist. But it is the unbelieving Jews who have broken away from the one Church of God, and not we. The promises to the seed of Abraham are ours, because we are the seed.

I have spent, perhaps, too long upon the elaboration of these points. But I have done so not only because of their intrinsic importance, but because I want to show you how profoundly corporate St. Paul's view of religion really is, and in how different a hemisphere his thought moves from that of the individualistic religion which is so often fathered upon him. If the corporate conception of religion

does not stand out prominently in this Epistle upon its doctrinal side, it does so stand out upon its practical side, and we want to recognize the former in order that we may understand the latter. To the latter we will now turn. What I want to point out in the remainder of this lecture is St. Paul's deep sense of the communion of saints, of the way in which all the people of God depend upon one another, and are bound to hold together, and help one another, because of the sacredness of those bonds which in Christ unite them. We see it in higher things, and we see it in lower ones, and the communion of saints is illustrated by both.

Now our first example shall be the example of St. Paul himself, and the way in which he interpreted his own experience, by seeing its necessity for the sake of the Church. We have dealt with this already in its larger issues, and we need not return to it. But we should notice how in detail St. Paul interprets his experiences in this way. Look, *e.g.*, at ch. i. 3-6: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our affliction, that we may be able to

comfort them that are in any affliction, through the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God. For as the sufferings of Christ abound unto us, even so our comfort also aboundeth through Christ. But whether we be afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation, or whether we be comforted it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer.' You see his point. The necessity for his suffering lies in the fact that it is the path to Divine comfort, and the necessity for his knowing by experience the Divine comfort lies in the fact that so only will he be able to comfort others in their affliction. Only Divine comfort is of any avail, and we cannot offer this unless we have ourselves experienced it. Now, how profoundly corporate a conception of Christianity that implies! The modern Christian may take his sufferings with a noble patience; he may be sure, to quote familiar words, that they are 'sent with some wise purpose,' but it is the individual purpose that he seems continually to have in mind—his own discipline, his own training, his own salvation. How

different was the mind of St. Paul! God's purpose for himself is not forgotten, but he does not think of explaining his sufferings in that way only. On the contrary, in dealing with him, God has the welfare of the body in view. His purpose is to bless the whole through the sufferings of the particular number. And now look at the other side. Just as blessing is to come to the body through him, so blessing must come to him through the body. If St. Paul is to be the glorying of his converts, as they are his 'in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ' (i. 14), they must have their own part in making him what he is. We cannot glory in that which has no connection with our own personalities, but only in that in which our personalities have found expression. Look at the tenth and eleventh verses. 'On whom we have set our hope, that He will also still deliver us; ye also helping together, or on behalf, by your supplications; that for the gift bestowed upon us by means of many, thanks may be given by many persons on our behalf.' What could express the corporate life of the communion of saints better than that? St. Paul

is going in continual danger of his life. From that danger he must be delivered, for the Church's sake. But the gift of deliverance must be bestowed upon him 'by means of many' through the continual intercession of the Church which needs him. Then, when the gift is his, the many, whose prayers have gained it, must also give thanks for it. Thanks must be given by many persons on his behalf. So St. Paul, like our Lord in the garden, calls the Church to watch with him, not for his own sake only, but for their own. Look at ch. iv. 15, and observe the same thing. 'All things are for your sakes'—all the Apostle's daily dying, and all the daily resurrection which waits upon it—'that the grace being multiplied through the many'—the grace given to St. Paul spreads outwards in ever-widening circles to others—'may cause the thanksgiving to abound to the glory of God.' There, again, you see, religion is corporate. 'Whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is glorified, all the members rejoice with it.' Yes, and not only rejoice, but give thanks also. The blessing given to

one is a blessing given to all; the Church, which is one in receiving blessing, must be one also in giving thanks for it.

Thus far, then, for the corporate life of the Church, as it seeks and receives the blessing of God. Let us now consider this corporate life, not in joy, but in pain; not the pain of the Cross, which is always the means of blessing, but the far worse pain which comes from a serious outbreak of sin. What is the mind of St. Paul about sin in the Church? Is it an individual matter for the individual conscience, or is it a corporate matter for the corporate conscience? Let us listen to St. Paul and see. We turn to ch. ii. 5: 'But if any hath caused sorrow'—St. Paul, I am inclined to think, is not here speaking of the incestuous Corinthian of the First Epistle, but of someone at Corinth who has injured and insulted the Apostle himself. 'If any hath caused sorrow, he hath caused sorrow, not to me, but in part (that I press not too heavily) to you all.' Just as St. Paul's joy, as he has just said, is the joy of them all, so St. Paul's pain is the pain of them all. 'Sufficient for such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by the many.'

You see how the sin of the one member was treated as the concern of the whole Church. They did not 'leave him to God,' or 'leave him to his own conscience,' as the individualist would wish to do. They dealt with his sin and punished him, and that, with so much of God's blessing upon their action, that the time has now come for his restoration. 'So that contrariwise ye should rather forgive him and comfort him, lest by any means such a one should be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow.' It is not enough that St. Paul should forgive, or even that God should forgive, as the individualist would suppose; forgiveness is the business of the body. 'Wherefore I beseech you to confirm your love toward him. For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye are obedient in all things.' Apostolic authority, you see, is perfectly real; it demands 'obedience.' 'But to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also: for what I also have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ.' You see how wonderfully the Lord seems regarded as

present with the Church, His Body. The forgiveness is all one. The forgiveness of the Corinthians carries with it St. Paul's, and St. Paul's forgiveness, as I understand him, carries with it the Lord's. Have we not here the very principle of Christian absolution? The poor repentant sinner cannot hear the absolving word of Christ. What can be brought home to him is the forgiveness of the Church and of the Apostle. But Christ and His Apostle and the Church are all one. In the forgiveness of those whose love he can see and feel, he will read the forgiveness of the unseen Lord, and be assured of that forgiveness. Translate 'in the face of Christ,' instead of 'in the person of Christ,' if you will. St. Paul cannot forgive in the presence of Christ what Christ would not forgive. What is solemnly done in the presence of Christ is done in the person of Christ, and the repentant sinner will feel it to be so. He will rejoice in the forgiveness of the Lord, as well as in that of the Church and of the Apostle. 'That no advantage may be gained over us'—us, not the sinner alone—'by Satan. For we are not ignorant

of his devices.' That is corporate religion. Sin is not just a matter between 'the sinner and his God'—there is no such thing as a God who is our private property. Sin is a matter which concerns the whole Christian body. It is sin against God, chiefly because it injures the body, through which His purpose is to be fulfilled. The body must punish it, and the body must forgive it, and the Apostle's absolution comes in to ratify what the body has done.

So we might go on through passage after passage of the Epistle. Our subject is, indeed, almost inexhaustible, and you must all work it out for yourselves. Let us leave now the local Church of God at Corinth, and see corporate religion at work in a wider sphere. Two whole chapters in the Epistle deal with the collection for the Church at Jerusalem, and we will now turn to them. Jerusalem was always a poor city. Vast crowds were brought together by the Temple services, far greater crowds than could possibly find work, and the Christians there had their full share of the poor. St. Paul evidently felt that their support by Christians in other parts of the world

was not only necessary in itself, but of vast importance as expressing and deepening the unity of the Church, and in chapters viii. and ix. he seems almost to exhaust the capacity of argument in order to awaken Corinthian generosity. Very ingenious St. Paul's appeals are; they vary from the grace and self-sacrifice of the Lord down to the natural and human desire not to be outdone by the Macedonians up in the North. We cannot consider all his appeals now. What I want to point out is the sense of corporate religion which speaks in them. Those splendid Macedonians understood Christianity. They did not, like the individualist to-day, think that the one sufficient thing was to give their own selves to the Lord. On the contrary, 'first they gave their own selves to the Lord, and then to' the Apostles 'by the will of God' (viii. 5). They understood that surrender to Christ involves surrender to those who truly represent Him. Nor did even surrender to the Apostles satisfy them. 'In much proof of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality' to the poor saints at

Jerusalem. That is a splendid paradox, often illustrated to-day. 'Their deep poverty abounded'—they were poor enough to be generous. And now it is the turn of the Corinthians. 'But as ye abound in everything, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all earnestness, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also' (viii. 7). Their love, too, is not to stop at the great object of their 'faith,' or at His Apostle either; it is to go out to the whole Israel of God. And why? Because all are one body, bound to mutual service. 'For I say not this, that others may be eased, and ye distressed: but by equality; your abundance being a supply at this present time for their want, that their abundance also may become a supply for your want; that there may be equality: as it is written, He that gathered much had nothing over; and he that gathered little had no lack' (viii. 13-15). That is corporate religion. Each is to regard his own advantages, whatever they may be, as a grand opportunity for being generous to the rest of his brethren. Within the Church God intends equality; not equality gained by any mechanical means of

human politics—that would never promote love; but equality gained by each man's abundance coming to the rescue of his brethren's need. Indeed, that is the very reason why God makes us so unequal. It is because He desires a corporate religion. 'And God is able to make all grace abound unto you'—yes, every advantage comes from Him. 'That ye, having always all sufficiency in everything, may'—what? Proceed to enjoy the situation? Not at all. 'That ye, having always all sufficiency in everything, may abound unto every good work: as it is written, He hath scattered abroad, he hath given to the poor; his righteousness abideth for ever' (ix. 8, 9). That is the law. The more you scatter your advantages, the more you keep your righteousness; just as the more you hoard your advantages, the more you scatter your righteousness. 'And He that supplieth seed to the sower and bread for food'—ah! the sower is the right model. He eats what he wants, and scatters the rest. 'Shall supply and multiply your seed for sowing'—that is what all our advantages are, just seed for sowing—'and increase

the fruits of your righteousness: ye being enriched in everything unto all liberality, which worketh through us thanksgiving to God. For the ministration of this service not only filleth up the measure of the wants of the Saints, but aboundeth also through many thanksgivings unto God' (ix. 10-12). That is the final end—thanksgiving to God and that corporate thanksgiving; the thanksgiving of many for the blessing received from Him through many. 'Seeing that through the proving of you by this ministration they glorify God for the obedience of your confession unto the Gospel of Christ, and for the liberality of your contribution unto them and unto all; while they themselves also, with supplication on your behalf, long after you by reason of the exceeding grace of God in you' (ix. 13, 14). A splendid ideal! This corporate religion of mutual service is the true form of obedience unto the Gospel of Christ, and the end is mutual intercession, mutual love, the longing that there may be 'no more sea,' but the Church all together in one place, every member knowing all and known of all.

And so we end our study of the mind

of St. Paul in this Second Epistle to the Corinthians. It is with a comparatively small part of our subject that we have been able to deal; there are splendid passages which we have been obliged to leave upon one side. But the study of his mind has nevertheless opened out wide vistas before us. It has revealed to us the Gospel, the ministerial life as it illustrates the Gospel, and the corporate life of the whole Church, the life of love and service, in which the acceptance of the Gospel is meant to issue. 'He died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again'—as they live for their brethren for His sake.

And is it not this corporate religion which is our great need to-day in the Church of England? A miserable absorption in our own personal salvation is, alas! no monopoly of Protestants. The temptation to it lies near us all, and it is but few of us who triumphantly resist it. We shall not get rid of it simply by embracing Catholic doctrines and adopting Catholic practices, much as these ought to help us. We shall only get rid of it as we

gain more of the spirit of our Lord, and 'reflecting as a mirror' His glory, are 'transformed into the same image' of self-sacrificing love. So only shall we, as we ought, live for the whole body, pray for it, and work for it, and not simply for ourselves, or for the little party in the Church to which we may belong. Yes, and may I add, in conclusion, that the whole for which we work and pray must be the right whole, the Body of Christ, the Church of God, and not just one among the passing empires of the world? Many and eloquent voices are sounding in our ears to-day, calling us to service and to sacrifice, urging us 'to spurn delights and live laborious days.' Very great, thus far, must be our sympathy, as Catholic Christians, with what these voices say. Only too often those who thus call us have never learned in Whom our sacrifice is to be made, or for what kingdom He calls us to make it. We Christians cannot make our own merely national aspirations, however much we may honour all that is noble in them. What was it which ruined God's purpose for Israel after the flesh? It was just that narrow nationalism to which so many are calling us

to-day, the belief that in serving merely national ends they were necessarily serving God. And our own danger of this is most real and serious, just because our national consciousness is so strong, and our Christian and Catholic consciousness so weak. There is such a thing, no doubt, as a Christian patriotism. But what is it? It is not the desire to aggrandize our own country at the expense of other countries, even though the desire may be accompanied by such half-hopes as we can form that we shall serve God's purpose by the way. It is the longing that our country may become just what God means it to become, that it may serve His purpose to the uttermost, whether by life or by death. It is no more inconsistent with the love of other countries than the Christian love of ourselves is inconsistent with the Christian love of our brethren; on the highest planes the interests of us all are one. But it is not for any earthly kingdom that our lives are to be spent; if we 'think imperially,' we must think for the empire of Christ. God's purpose is for the world, and it is to be realized, not through any of the passing empires of that world, but

through the Church, which is Christ's Body. We may have our interest in the British Empire and the communion of Englishmen, but our 'belief' is in the Catholic Church and the communion of saints. The bonds which unite us with the Christian German, or the Christian African, are deeper, though they may be less obvious, than the bonds which unite us with the non-Christian Englishman. Once more, we must live for the right whole. 'We look not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are not seen: for the things that are seen'—the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them—'are temporal, but the things which are not seen'—the Kingdom of God and His righteousness—'are eternal.' 'Our citizenship is in heaven.'

BILLING AND SONS, LTD., PRINTERS, GUILDFORD

Selections from
Mr. Edward Arnold's List of Theological Books.

The Parting of the Ways. Essays on Judaism and Christian Origins. By Graduates of Jesus College, Cambridge. With an Introduction by the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. 10s. 6d. net.

The object of these essays is to trace the origin of Christianity from Judaism, and its development till the final parting of the two religions. With the exception of the Introduction and Essays I. and III., all the writers have taken their degrees quite recently, and though they have obtained high honours at the University, the volume must be judged as a young men's book. As such it may prove the more interesting as illustrating the ideas of some of our younger theologians. The essays are not the product of any school, but represent all shades of thought in the Church of England, whilst one is written by a Nonconformist, and another by a Jewish scholar.

The Faith of an Average Man. By the Rev. Charles H. S. Matthews, M.A., Author of 'A Parson in the Australian Bush,' etc. 3s. 6d. net.

The author is profoundly convinced that on the one hand the endless restlessness of modern life is a witness to man's need of a vital faith, and on the other that the continued vitality of the historic Church of England is in itself a proof of her power to meet this fundamental need of men. The position he occupies, and would in this book commend to others, may best be described as a kind of progressive Catholicism, a true *via media* between an exclusive Protestantism on the one hand, which seems to him to be founded on a view of the Bible no longer tenable, and an equally exclusive Catholicism on the other, which in its turn seems to be founded on a no less untenable view of the Church.

The Church and Modern Problems. By C. F. Garbett, M.A., Vicar of Portsea. 3s. 6d. net.

An interesting volume, composed of addresses mainly delivered in the course of the author's ordinary parochial work during the last two years. They are all united by the attempt to state the attitude of the Church to some of the many modern problems of religious thought and action. Among these are Modernism, Rationalism, Agnosticism, the Higher Criticism Inspiration, the Reunion of Christendom, Divorce, Temperance Reform, and Socialism. The attitude of the Church to all these tremendous intellectual, moral, and social problems is briefly argued and discussed with tact and ability.

LONDON : EDWARD ARNOLD, 41 & 43 MADDOX STREET, W.

The Mind of St. Paul : As Illustrated by his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. By Canon H. L. Goudge, D.D., Principal of Ely Theological College. 3s. 6d. net.

This is an endeavour to exhibit the mind of St. Paul, by a comparison of passages in this Epistle, as to the nature of Apostolic authority, the extent of the Gospel, and the Christian life, both individual and compact.

Miracles in the New Testament. A Study of Evidence. By the Rev. J. M. Thompson, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Cloth. 3s. 6d. net.

The recent action of the Bishop of Winchester with regard to the author of this book has brought it considerable notoriety. That it is an important work may, however, be deduced from the fact that Dr. Sanday has thought it worth while to devote a sermon, preached in the University Church at Cambridge, to meeting its argument. Moreover, it has called forth some notable articles in the *Guardian* from the pen of Canon Scott Holland.

The Crown of Thorns. By the Rev. A. E. Burn, Vicar of Halifax, Prebendary of Gaia Major in Lichfield Cathedral. Cloth. 2s. 6d. net.

Meditations for Lent, Holy Week, and Easter, representing the substance of teaching given to many town congregations during the last ten years.

St. Paul in the Light of Modern Research. By the Rev. J. R. Cohu, Rector of Aston Clinton, Bucks ; sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford ; Author of ' The Old Testament in the Light of Modern Research.' Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

Homiletic Review.—' The treatment in every chapter is profoundly thoughtful, but exceedingly lucid in expression. The book is a real contribution to the literature of divinity.'

Preachers and Teachers. By James Gilliland Simpson, M.A., D.D., Canon of St. Paul's ; Recently Principal of the Leeds Clergy School. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

Church Times.—' The whole book may be profitably studied both by preachers and hearers.'

Manchester Guardian.—' Dr. Simpson's new book possesses in a very high degree the merit of being readable.'

Guardian.—' This charming and interesting volume.'

The Clergy and Social Service. Cambridge Lectures on Pastoral Theology. By the Very Rev. W Moore Ede, D.D., Dean of Worcester. Cloth. 2s. 6d. net.

The Servant of the Lord. By Robert Hatch Kennett, D.D., Canon of Ely, and Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge; Author of 'In Our Tongues.' 2s. 6d. net.

In Our Tongues. Some Hints to Readers of the English Bible. By Robert Hatch Kennett. 3s. 6d. net.

The Book of Books. A Study of the Bible. By Canon Lonsdale Ragg, B.D., Rector of Tickencote and Prebendary of Buckden in Lincoln Cathedral. 5s. net.

Holborn Review.—'Mr. Ragg's volume is a timely and welcome piece of work. The author is an orthodox High Churchman, whose leanings are fundamentally traditional. His mind, however, is open to new light, and he sees clearly that the old-fashioned view of Scripture can no longer be held in face of the difficulties which modern investigation has brought to light. Yet this has meant no abandonment of his reverence for Scripture, no surrender of the claim which he makes for its uniqueness. His work will be found helpful by many who are conscious that great changes are required, but who are also conscious that the Bible must hold a solitary place in their affection and allegiance.'

The Spirit of Power. The Church in the Early Second Century. By the Rev. Ernest A. Edghill, M.A., B.D., Sub-Warden of the College of St. Saviour in Southwark; Hulsean Lecturer in the University of Cambridge. 5s. net.

Jerusalem under the High Priests. Five Lectures on the Period between Nehemiah and the New Testament. By Edwyn Bevan, Author of 'The House of Seleucus.' Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Outlines of the Synoptic Record. By the Rev. Bernard Hugh Bosanquet, Vicar of Thames Ditton, and R. A. Wenham. 6s.

Cross-Bench Views of Current Church Questions. By H. Hensley Henson, D.D., Canon of Westminster. 12s. 6d.

The Diary of a Modernist. By William Scott Palmer, Author of 'An Agnostic's Progress,' etc. Crown 8vo., cloth. 5s. net.

Church Times.—'Mr. Scott Palmer always has something to say that is worth hearing.'

A Reported Change in Religion. By Onyx. 3s. 6d.

Letters to a Godchild. By Alice Gardner, Associate and Lecturer ot Newham College, Cambridge. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

The Art of Reading and Speaking. By the late Canon J. Fleming. Ninth Impression. 3s. 6d.

Across the Bridges. **A Study of Social Life in South London.** By ALEXANDER PATERSON. With Preface by the BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK. 6s.

Evening News.—'An extraordinary valuable book on the life of the children of the poor in South London. In its way it is the most remarkable work seen for years.'

How to Deal with Men. By the Rev. PETER GREEN, M.A., Canon of Manchester. 2s. 6d. net.

How to Deal with Lads. **A Handbook of Church Work.** By the Rev. PETER GREEN, M.A., Canon of Manchester; Rector of Sacred Trinity, Salford. Second Impression. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

Morning Leader.—'Good books about boys and boys' clubs are hard to meet with, and Mr. Green must be congratulated on having made a valuable addition to the very small number which are really worth consulting.'

Eighteen Years in Uganda and East Africa. By the Right Rev. ALFRED R. TUCKER, Bishop of Uganda. 1 vol. With Illustrations from the author's sketches. 7s. 6d. net.

A Parson in the Australian Bush. By the Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS. With Illustrations by the Author. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

Extract from a Letter from the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: 'Your breezy and inspiriting book . . . will do real good in England, and I hope in Australia too.'

A Memoir of the Very Rev. Edward Charles Wickham, Dean of Lincoln, and Formerly Headmaster of Wellington College. By Canon LONSDALE RAGG, Rector of Tickencote. Illustrated. 7s. 6d. net.

Letters of Mary Sibylla Holland. Selected and Edited by her Son, BERNARD HOLLAND. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Benjamin Jowett: Master of Balliol. A Personal Memoir. By the Hon. LIONEL TOLLEMACHE. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Theodore of Studium: His Life and Times. By ALICE GARDNER, Associate and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. With Illustrations. 10s. 6d. net.

Ten Great and Good Men. Lectures by HENRY MONTAGU BUTLER, D.D., D.C.L., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. 6s. net.

BIOGRAPHIES OF SAINTLY MEN.

Francis: the Little Poor Man of Assisi. By JAMES ADDERLEY. With Portrait. 3s. 6d.

Monsieur Vincent: a Short Life of St. Vincent de Paul. By JAMES ADDERLEY. With Devotional Portrait. 3s. 6d.

Hugh of Lincoln. By CHARLES MARSON. With Portrait. 3s. 6d.

54123 227.3R
Goudge, H. L. G72
Mind of St. Paul

227.3R
G72

54123.